THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In his Croall Lectures the Rev. Principal William A. Curtis faces the question, What held back the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels from exerting its full power in the instruction of the Church? What kept it so long in the background of systems of Christian doctrine and even of Christian preaching?

For answer six influences are noted, but we are cautioned that they are not to be thought of as deliberate motives, determined by psychological expediency in the popular interest of the Church; rather did they lie deep within the springs of instinctive adjustment to the ever-changing situation of the religious life.

First, the persistent feeling that the teaching office is in Jesus a subordinate function. But it is here contended that the Teaching so far from occupying a subordinate or secondary place in our Lord's life is itself an expression of His sovereign authority. When the Teacher is a Prophet speaking for God eternal truth of saving power, and Himself the living Word embodied, Kings have no attribute that the Teacher lacks. Further, no miracle that He wrought reveals Him as divine so intimately and convincingly as the opening of His mind and consciousness, and there is no aspect of His redemptive suffering which is not illumined by His words.

Secondly, the fact that the earliest exponents of the mind of Jesus were preachers, missionaries, and apologists, whose message had to be adjusted to the defending of His name. They had to seek to remove the offence of His Messianic claim as well as the offence of the Cross. 'Accordingly, whereas the Master had taught and preached a doctrine of the Kingdom of God from first to last, the Disciples were constrained by the reproach heaped upon His name to teach and proclaim Him as the Messiah-King who was also the Suffering Servant of the Lord.' 'They became insensibly His interpreters rather than the recorders and repeaters of His express teaching.' And Jesus must have counted upon this. Else why did He refrain from presenting them with an ordered system of teaching?

Thirdly, the desire of those who reproduced the gospel message to state it in terms that would be immediately effective and intelligible in new surroundings. In Asia Minor, in Greece, in Egypt, and in Rome the teaching of the Kingdom and the hope of a Jewish Messiah would make no direct appeal, and the very language of the Synoptic records sounds foreign and remote. 'It is not possible to do justice to the Gospel according to John, or the gospel according to Paul, if we make allowance only for their authors' idiosyncrasies and individual experience, and fail to keep in view the environment in which they found themselves and the thought-world in which they moved.' But their versions of the ultimate realities of Christian truth and experience are not at spiritual variance with that of Jesus.

Dr. Curtis appears willing to grant that the tributes of Paul and John to Jesus are a thing of words, however sincere and arresting, that faith as well as memory speaks through them, that there is subjectivity in their witness. But they are justified as pointing to that personal uniqueness which lent an added force to the gospel Jesus preached. The Christian believer of to-day who may not accept the Pauline and Johannine Christologies must try to render them into such equivalents as modern thought and speech are capable of providing.

Fourthly, the desire of those who taught and preached the gospel to re-phrase it in order also to avoid dangerous and unnecessary misconception. This is illustrated in the infrequent use of the phrase, Kingdom of God or Kingdom of Heaven, outside of the Synoptic Teaching. There must have been a natural misgiving in the Early Church as to the propriety of using the idea of the Kingdom in lands where Roman Imperialism held sway. 'Although persecution induced no wavering of Christian resolution to apply to Jesus the titles Lord and King, drawn from earthly majesty, the subtler influences of missionary accommodation may have helped to shift the emphasis of Christian teaching from the "Kingdom" to the "Church," from admission to the Kingdom to

regeneration, or to salvation, or to entrance into eternal life.'

Fifthly, the feeling that, as the teaching of Jesus was completed before His death so far as words were concerned, it must afford a necessarily incomplete expression of His mind. But, as Dr. CURTIS points out from his essentially conservative standpoint in Synoptic criticism, the subjects of death and resurrection and ascended glory were not passed over by Jesus in His teaching. That is why the disciples were enabled, after they had recovered from the first shock of His death, to defend it on the strength of Scriptures which none but Jesus and those whom He enlightened had ever related to the hope of a Saviour and King.

Finally, the fear lest through adherence to the teaching of Jesus in its first simplicity the Way of Salvation should be made too simple and easy. Here again Dr. CURTIS shows himself to be only in partial sympathy with a motive, whether conscious or unconscious, which retarded the influence in Christendom of the Synoptic teaching of Jesus. He would ask us to beware not less of every 'Nulla salus' formula which Christian thought has advanced. If conservative in criticism, he is liberal and broad in doctrinal outlook, as the following passage shows: 'If there are individuals who are drawn to accept freely the gracious teaching of the Lord and to rest in its simplicity but are not moved to embrace the systems which reflection and experience have put at their disposal, and are even repelled by them, it is not ours to judge them save by their fruits in life and character. Not to impose but to offer in its abounding fullness the Truth in Christ is our vocation and our privilege in His name. It is theirs and theirs alone to open their arms and accept it in accordance with the promptings of their hearts.'

The late Dr. D. M. McINTYRE, Principal of the Bible Training Institute at Glasgow, has been known largely for earnest devotional works, and few suspected him of competent and independent scholarship. But a posthumous work, *Some Notes on the Gospels*,[1] edited by the Lecturer in Greek in the University of Leeds, Mr. F. F. Bruce, reveals both a grasp of the essential problems of New Testament study and also an independence of judgment that throw a clear light on the whole situation out of which the Gospels arose.

The contribution which this little book makes to the synoptic problem is, in the main, an insistence on the value of the oral tradition. Like Streeter, Dr. McINTYRE is satisfied that the Two-document Hypothesis is not sufficient to explain the facts. And he holds that the value of Form Criticism lies in its effort to get behind the two documents, Mark and Q, to the situation out of which they arose. It corrects the unjust depreciation that has lately been visited upon the 'oral theory.' Dr. McINTYRE quotes with approval Peake's words, 'we have evidence that the Gospel of Mark actually rests on oral teaching,' but he goes further. In this book the main interest will be found in the sketch he gives of the actual situation behind the Gospels.

At first the Apostolic witness would be quite unformed. A little company of men and women who loved the Lord would come together for worship, but the interest which most strongly possessed them was the desire to hear something more of the Master—what He said, how He acted, what experiences He underwent. And those who had some fresh incident to relate would communicate it to the faithful brethren assembled, while others would rehearse over and over some familiar episode.

The earliest preaching by which the Apostolic tradition received a more or less coherent *form* had been set to evangelical uses. But the swift inrush of converts into the Church, together with the vast number of inquirers who stood on the threshold, called for a more highly organized system of instruction. The almost simultaneous introduction of the Christian teaching into other towns of Palestine and beyond would necessitate a similar provision. The new believers, with the numerous inquirers, would desire as full a statement as possible regarding the manner of our Lord's life in the flesh. By degrees an order of catechists was instituted; these would receive direction from the Apostolic company ('the Apostles' teaching' had become a technical term), after which they would deliver to the eager thousands what had been communicated to themselves.

As the gospel spread into new fields those catechetical classes would become more numerous. First in Palestine, then in the great world centres —Antioch, Ephesus, Rome—finally in every province of the empire, those schools of faith would be established. There would come, inevitably, a *selection* of topics which would most readily minister faith to the hearers. Consequently almost everything narrated in the Gospels lends itself to evangelical impression.

The *method of instruction* varied. In Palestine

[1] Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 1s. 6d. net.

at first the teaching would be exclusively oral, probably by dictation (according to the Jewish custom), but we cannot think of this as the only way. There would certainly be instruction which the catechumen committed to memory, but there would be addresses of a less restricted character. Moreover the Apostolic tradition would inevitably attain fixity by frequent repetition, and, because the tradition existed in different forms, there would be divergences. Papias says of the *Logia* of Matthew : ' Each man interpreted them as he was able,' and the translation from Aramaic to Greek would multiply such differences.

After a time the instructions of the catechists would be committed to *writing*. The teacher would read the lesson and the catechumens would copy upon their tablets the words as they were uttered. Perhaps the incident in Jn 8 (the woman taken in adultery) may have been a stray lesson from a catechetical instruction which has found its way into the Fourth Gospel. We may almost pick out a number of such ' instructions ' from the Second Gospel, set like bricks in a thin layer of mortar.

As soon as the catechetical lessons took written form, the impulse to make a *collection* of them would arise. Probably this was the first stage in the composition of those ' digests ' which St. Luke speaks of in his preface. We can imagine a catechumen, who has been receiving instruction from (let us say) Mark or Silvanus, collecting a full series of incidents or sayings belonging to the Lord's ministry. He would add to these any others which might reach him. Some would be at first hand and altogether worthy of trust. Others might come through intermediaries, and be less reliable. St. Luke tells us that many such digests were known to him, and it is a fair inference from his words in the preface to his Gospel that he derived at least some of his material from them. (The expression ' ministers of the Word ' may point to catechists.)

Dr. McIntyre has something to say about a statement which has been so often repeated that we have taken it for granted, namely, that for many years after the Resurrection the Church had no keen desire to preserve for futurity the memorials of the earthly life of her Lord. This supposed fact is attributed to one or other of two causes. Either the hope of the speedy return of the Saviour so completely filled the minds of believers that they cast no backward look ; or they were so eager to communicate the good news that the purely historical aspects of the life of Christ were pushed out of sight.

Neither of these reasons, Dr. McIntyre urges, has any weight. Both in the anticipation of the Advent, and in the proclamation of the gospel, it was the Person of Christ that was centrally and supremely present to the thought of the Church, and that Person was never for a moment dissociated from the life-story of Jesus of Nazareth. The Apostolic teaching ranged over the whole of our Lord's ministry and went not one step beyond, except to draw such inferences as faith might require. And, as St. Luke tells us, this witness was reduced to writing at an early date, not by one or two but by many.

The name of Dr. W. A. Visser 'T Hooft is widely known and highly respected especially in student circles. After some years of service with the World Student Christian Federation he became one of the joint secretaries of the World Council of Churches.

He has recently written a very thoughtful and timely little book which has been translated from the French by Dorothy Mackie and Hugh Martin. Its title, *The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church*,[1] can hardly be regarded as either very happy or very illuminating. Its general subject is the place and responsibility of the Christian Church in the present world-crisis. It deserves to be widely read and studied, for it goes down to root principles and at the same time makes valuable suggestions as to the practical application of these principles to world affairs.

In the present crisis into which the nations have come the supremely important question is, What is God doing ? and What does God intend ? The Church especially must face this question, for the terrible judgment that is being passed upon the nations clearly begins with the House of God. As a leading Dutch churchman has said, ' Through these events God has opened a profoundly serious conversation with the churches. . . . It is a conversation about judgment, conversion, and renewal of life. The churches are called to render account of their past and their present. . . . One could hardly find any means more drastic than those which God is actually using to awaken the Church from the torpor and contentment which in the past made it so unfaithful to its calling. The dechristianizing of the western world, which is only now revealing its true character and consequences, is not only due to the defection of the world. It is due to the apostasy of the Church.'

The Church, therefore, must recover her soul, her sense of unity, her consciousness of her divine

[1] S.C.M. ; 2s. 6d. net.

mission. Hopeful signs of this recovery are not wanting. In churches where the Bible had a place of honour, but not the central place, the Word of God is beginning to speak with authority. This is especially true of the churches under the Cross. 'We notice among us,' one report says, 'that interest is concentrated upon the study of the Bible as it has not been for centuries. In this dark winter in which we live, men from the Church and from other circles are meeting in the light and shade of the open Book. Scores of Bible groups are formed in the large towns. They are not devotional circles nor yet discussion groups. In fact it is not easy to say what they are because it is connected with the mystery of the Church. The Word is at work.'

The ideal must be recovered of the Church as the light, the salt, the conscience of the world, and every member of the Church must realize and accept the responsibility and the privilege of this ministry. 'Every Christian in his professional work is a minister plenipotentiary of the Church. Through him the Church is represented in the corner of the world where he is at work. . . . A refusal would mean no less than the denial of the lordship of Christ over our lives. We cannot go on being Christians *and* doctors, Christians *and* industrialists, Christians *and* workers. We cannot go on obeying Christ as private individuals only and living "like our colleagues" in our professions. The schizophrenia of obeying the Gospel in personal relationships and obeying the laws of the world in professional decisions ends by convincing the world—and ourselves—that the Gospel is really opium for the people.'

The pressure of events has forced to the front the question of the reconstitution of the universal Church. Accordingly there exists to-day a longing of unprecedented intensity for Church unity. It would be a mistake to regard this longing as a mere passing fashion. It springs from the suffering heart of the Church. It must be seriously studied, watched over, and guided with all due care. For truth must not be sacrificed to unity. Amid the dire confusions of our time there are many who minimize doctrinal differences and loudly call for Church unity as an example to the distracted nations and a means to world unity. But this is to reverse the true order of things. 'The only unity which is worth while for the Church and the world is a unity rooted in the life of the Church itself and not dictated by reasons of expediency.'

The appeal of the Roman Church has its strong attractions. It presents, from a distance at least, the appearance of a strong frame of unity, a haven of rest in a restless world. But in making its claim to be the one true and infallibly guided Church it lifts itself above criticism and assumes the very point to be proved. As Calvin rightly said, 'It is inadmissible to take the title of Church in order to disguise it in such a way that it acts as a prejudice to prevent any examination of doctrine.' Though in recent times various representatives of the Roman Church have held out the olive branch they have never been allowed 'to reach the point of setting out from the Biblical conception of the Church, and bringing the existing Church under examination. The appeal to the Word of God is not admitted.'

The Protestant doctrine of the Universal Church has been gravely misunderstood, as if it taught that there is only an invisible unity and that the external manifestation of it is quite secondary. The Reformers did, indeed, teach that the Body of Christ is not simply to be identified with the visible Church, but they did not teach that the unity of the Church is necessarily invisible. On the contrary, they desired and worked for visible unity. Calvin said, 'It cannot happen that those who are truly convinced that God is their common Father and that Christ is the one Lord of them all should not be joined to each other in brotherly love, to commune together for their common good.' And Luther said, 'The communion has two forms, first that we rejoice in Jesus Christ, second that all Christians rejoice in one another, that we become one bread, one body, one community. That is the true fraternal unity of Christians.'

A very real unity, God-given yet capable of being manifested to the world in word and deed! Such unity cannot be engineered. 'The perpetual temptation of all œcumenical efforts is to seek unity for its own sake. It is always noticeable how easily inter-ecclesiastical discussions can become purely human negotiations along purely horizontal lines, in which ecclesiastical confessions and constitutions are compared in order to find a common denominator, but in which one forgets to submit them all to the Word of God. . . . In a true œcumenical movement there is no room for bargaining or for ecclesiastical politics. The one question is this—do we or do we not all submit ourselves to the same Word of God?'

What part has the Church to play in the construction of a new world order? This task—the restoration of peace, the defence of justice and liberty, the establishment of better social and international conditions—is so urgent and the need so desperate that many Christians have come

to regard it as the Church's primary work, and desire unity so that the Church may become a more powerful auxiliary of the forces that make for world betterment. It must therefore be firmly maintained that the Church's primary work is to offer in Christ's name an eternal salvation. The Bible view is that this world is so deeply under the divine judgment that the fashion of it passes away and a new world, a new creation of God, will take its place. We must beware of acting as if our Lord said, 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, *in order that* all these things may be added unto you.' The primacy of the Kingdom of God is absolute.

And the gospel of the Kingdom is alone adequate to the fearful depths of man's need. 'The present war means the destruction in many European lands of what was left of responsible communal life, and the nihilist spirit penetrates even many of those who are defending their country against the totalitarian invasion. So the taming of this unchained beast that modern man has become is an issue of life or death. If man does not discover in time that not everything is permissible, if he does not cease to deify his own desires and trust to the voice of his blood, there will soon be no more politics, because there will be no more *polis*, no city, no earthly order. . . . Such men need nothing less than the great shock of meeting the living God. They must discover that God *is*, and that He puts His hand on them, asking, Adam, where art thou? They must meet their Judge who will tell them that not everything is permissible, and their Saviour who will tell them that they have not been abandoned to their own resources.'

At the same time the Church must struggle ceaselessly for world betterment and must seek under the Spirit's guidance to interpret the Word in its bearing upon all the departments of human life so that the social, political, and international order may be brought more perfectly into line with the will of God. In recent days the Church has made notable pronouncements of this sort, and done something to fulfil her function as God's watchman. 'We do not know if the world will need the warning of the watchman. It may be that the present disorder will become a settled condition, and that we are entering upon a time when the message of God will remain a voice in the wilderness. But it may also be that God in His patience gives us still time for reconstruction, a new opportunity to create some order in the earth. In either case our duty is the same. So long as it is day and we are able to work, we must patiently reconstruct the continually threatened world order. But we must look beyond any and every reconstruction of the world, for the coming of that true order in which all things shall be made new.'

The New Order.

I. The New Approach to Theology.

By the Right Reverend J. W. Hunkin, D.D., Bishop of Truro.

The present age is suffering from lack of conviction. People hardly know where they are in Politics or in Morals. Least of all do they know where they are in Theology. And this lack of conviction is paralysing and slows down reform and reconstruction.

The question raised in this brief paper is this: can we find a new approach to Theology which will lead to conviction at least on a limited ground? We live in a world dominated by Natural Science. The methods and tests of Natural Science colour all our thinking. Every piece of evidence has to be examined and weighed, and then accepted for what it is worth and no more. We begin with the near and clear and work out to the edge of the unknown. We form the most reasonable hypothesis we can, consistent with the facts at our disposal, and subsequently revise our hypothesis, or even discard it, as more facts come to light.

In Theology, then, let us begin just exactly where we are *here-and-now*. That is the true *Modernism*, the word being derived from the Latin *modo*, 'just now.' We begin with ourselves here and now. We think of ourselves as body *plus*: we refer to that *plus* when we use the words *mind*, *soul*, *spirit*. These words are used somewhat vaguely. The body is a definite *thing* which we can touch and see. But of the relation between *body* and *mind*, *soul*, or *spirit* we have no clear idea. I confess that none of the theories hitherto

propounded with regard to the relationship satisfies me in the least. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the word *spirit* is not *vox et præterea nihil*: it does stand for a real element, the element, indeed, which I feel to be at once the central and the highest element of my entire make-up. I enjoy my food, I depend very much indeed on the health of my body, but still I feel myself to be essentially something more than a piece of bodily mechanism—a spiritual being. I observe other similar beings around me. With some of them I am linked very closely; and indeed without them I should not be myself. The fundamental character of this linkage and association with others is illustrated by my use of language. Not only can I not speak without the use of language: I cannot even think without it. And language I do not invent: I learn. So that in my inner make-up I belong inescapably and fundamentally to an association of other spirits like my own.

In intercourse with these fellow-spirits I perceive qualities such as courage, kindness, fidelity—spiritual qualities. These are constantly making their appearance to my admiration and delight. And in the world around me other delightful things are constantly making their appearance too: the beauty of the flowers and of the changing face of the earth and sky, fresh beauty continually coming into existence, continually *created*. 'Creation' is the word I use. I know at least a little of what it means: for, I myself, in a very small minute way am a creator.

And if I create anything I want it to be a unity. To satisfy me at all it must have a certain unity of its own. Every artist will recognize the truth of this, and everybody has at least an element of the artist in him. Further, when I look around me I see marks of a unity of this kind upon the whole fabric and process of creation. There is, of course, that which mars it: call it *Evil*, evident enough in all conscience. And yet the existence of evil does not do away with the evidence of essential and fundamental unity.

All this points from creation to a Creator, vastly greater than any product of creation, not less but infinitely more than any creature, more in power, in grasp, in wholeness, the very quintessence of spirit. The Creator-Spirit is unceasingly active: has ever been so, as far back as our thought can range: will ever be so, as far ahead as we can imagine. Theology is 'the study or science which treats of God' says the great dictionary of Dr. Murray; and 'God' is the Creator-Spirit. Among all created things man himself is obviously in a specially close relationship with the Creator-Spirit. Theology, therefore, very soon turns to human history for evidence of the Spirit's activity. And it finds evidence over the whole field, though some of it is hard to interpret. There is evidence of the activity of the Creator-Spirit in and through men of all races from the dawn of history and even beyond it. Here we enter upon the study of what is rather oddly called 'Comparative Religion.' But before we attempt to survey the whole province of this study, we shall do well first of all to follow where the scent is strongest. On this point there can be little doubt. By far the greatest of all religious classics is the little library of small volumes which we call *the Bible*. Of all the people of antiquity the Hebrews proved themselves to have the greatest genius for religion: and the Old Testament leads naturally and inevitably to the New. By whatever standards of measurement we use, the person of Christ marks the peak of all religion known to man. The New Testament is pivoted on Christ, and He has turned the B.C. of human history into the A.D.

The language of the Old Testament is Hebrew. It is significant that the language of the New Testament is Greek. Long before the last of the twenty-seven documents of the New Testament was written, into the stream of Hebrew thought had flown a powerful tributary from Greece. Of all peoples the Greeks had proved themselves to have the greatest intellectual power, and the Christianity which finally, to some extent at least, dominated Europe, was the Greek version of Christianity. Christianity, the movement started by Christ, became identified with a society known as the Church. Theology studies Church history even more eagerly than secular history for evidence of the activity of the Creator-Spirit.

Joachim of Flora (d. 1202) distinguished three Ages of the World: the Old Testament—the age of the Father; the New Testament—the age of the Son; and the third—the age of the Holy Spirit. Certainly, according to the Fourth Gospel, the age in which we live now is the age of the Holy Spirit. 'I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away,' Christ is reported to have said, '. . . if I go, I will send him (the Paraclete) unto you . . . when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth' (Jn $16^{7.\ 13}$). The Theology, therefore, which starts from the here-and-now will naturally begin with a study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The history of this doctrine has been traced in the Ancient Church by the late Professor H. B. Swete, and in later centuries by Dr. H. Watkin-Jones. Very little development can be detected. Hardly any of the classical Theological writers add anything fresh. The subject indeed is treated with over-caution. Theologians have been so dazzled by the transcendence of God, that they have almost forgotten the immanence of God.

For a study of this we must look to the more mystical writers, and Dean Inge's book on *Christian Mysticism* will serve as a useful introduction. Even so our gleanings will be but slight and we shall be driven back upon our own spiritual experiences. We can study our own contacts with other human spirits and explore the analogies and hints they offer when we come to consider the relation between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. After all the fundamental truth contained in the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation is the truth not of the gulf between God and man but of the closeness.

Here we should expect more help from modern Psychology than, in point of fact, we obtain. Modern Psychology, so far, has told us little about what happens when spirit meets spirit. Indeed, it generally avoids the use of the term 'spirit' altogether. Yet the term stands for a reality, and spirit with spirit does meet. Here Life itself is still our best teacher, and our own friends help us most.

Nineteen years ago Dr. C. E. Raven, now Master of Christ's College and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, then a Canon of Liverpool, planned a course of study for the clergy of that diocese centred upon the work of the Spirit in Nature and History, in Scripture and the Church. In the following year Dr. Raven gave a series of lectures at Harvard, and another at Cambridge, and published them together under the title *The Creator Spirit.* The book did not receive the attention it deserved. It is time it was read and pondered again. The course of study at Liverpool bore encouraging fruit not only in that diocese but all over the dioceses of England. 'We saw enough' Dr. Raven says, 'to be very sure that, where a living faith in the Spirit was given, great results did in fact follow.'[1] It is a matter for great regret that an enterprise which had begun so well passed from Dr. Raven's hands and petered out. In his latest book *Good News of God* (August, 1943), he expresses the hope that the time for its revival is near.[2] To urge that revival is the purpose of this brief paper.

[1] *Good News of God*, 103, 104. [2] P. 104.

Literature.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

It is characteristic of an age of specialization like our own that Theological Colleges should in practice admit the desirability of dividing among several teachers the big subject which from the Middle Ages to quite recent times used to be handled by one. No doubt something is to be said for having in one Seminary Professors of Apologetics, Systematic Theology, and Christian Ethics. Yet there is something to be said for the old method; and nothing can be better or more convincingly said on its behalf than to point to how Emeritus-Dean Albert C. Knudson of Boston has made valuable contributions to all these departments. He has crowned his notable books on 'The Validity of Christian Experience,' 'The Doctrine of God,' and 'The Doctrine of Redemption' with as notable a volume—*The Principles of Christian Ethics* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.75). To what extent this valuable work is procurable meantime in Britain is somewhat obscure; but it is a book of which to keep a note for purchase when available.

Dr. Knudson is at once a master of his subject and a master of limpid English. Not often does one find a book at once so erudite and so readable. From the extensive though 'selected' bibliography, from the Index, from the footnotes and above all from the matter one has ample evidence of the width of the author's study and his acquaintance with the views of all important writers on the subject or parts of the subject down to the present day. He moves through all with clear eyes and sound judgment and what he modestly puts forth as an Introduction to Christian Ethics will be found by very many to be all they need.

The book is in five parts: (*a*) Introduction, dealing with the Province and the History of Christian Ethics; (*b*) Presuppositions, the Moral Nature, Sin and Conversion; (*c*) The Moral Ideal, with chapters on the Principles of Love and Perfection and Christian Character; (*d*) Practical Application, the Individual, the Family, the State, Church and Culture, and the Economic Order; (*e*) The Validity of Christian Ethics.

In his treatment he handles a multiplicity of questions which are very much 'alive' at the present time, for example, what is the source of moral authority? is 'conversion' necessary? is 'power-ethics' valid? is war inevitable? is birth-control legitimate?

His concluding chapter states frankly the common criticisms of Christian morality, and as frankly admits whatever real point there may be in them. Yet to each and all of them Dr. Knudson gives a satisfying answer. He is convinced that it is a case either of Christian morality or no morality at all, and that the world's only hope lies in the Christian Ethic being taken seriously.

This work, the product of one who has observed the human panorama with deep interest and sym-

pathy and understanding throughout a long life, and for nearly half a century has been teaching as well as learning, is one of the best gifts that our days of confusion, unsettlement, and perplexity have provided. W. D. NIVEN.

THE IRON AGE.

The American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, in co-operation with Xenia Theological Seminary for the first two campaigns, and subsequently with the Pittsburg-Xenia Theological Seminary, carried out excavation at Tell Beit Mirsim, in the Shephelah of Judah, during four campaigns, commencing in 1926. Current accounts of the work, as it proceeded, were given in the Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research and elsewhere, and Dr. Albright devoted to it a lengthy chapter in his book 'The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible.' But the fully detailed reports have been reserved for publication in *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. Already three parts have appeared: Tell Beit Mirsim, Volume I.: The Pottery of the First Three Campaigns (*Annual*, Volume XII.); Volume Ia.: The Bronze Age Pottery of the Fourth Campaign (*Annual*, Volume XII.); Volume II.: The Bronze Age (*Annual*, Volume XVII.). Now Volume III. has appeared, with the title, *The Iron Age* (*Annual*, Volume XXI.–XXII.) (American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven; $4.00).

Thus has been brought to a close a notable piece of recording. Tell Beit Mirsim did not yield any spectacular finds, but, because of the presence of numerous destruction levels, it gave very great aid in the determination of the chronology of ceramic types so that these have now come to be recognized as one of the main criteria in the identification of the different levels at any site in Palestine. In this regard it is interesting to recall that Dr. Albright, in the course of his preface to Volume I., wrote: 'No emphasis can be laid upon the *texture* of potsherds. It is infinitely safer to avoid this elusive field. In the same age every possible variation of texture may be illustrated by specimens belonging to different categories of pottery.' In the present publication there is included a chapter by two ceramic experts, Professors J. L. Kelso and J. Palin Thorley. In the first part of the chapter they deal with the composition of clay and its preparation, with the varying degrees of plasticity, porosity, and vitrification, with the 'throwing' and 'turning' technique in the making of pottery vessels, and with the processes of glazing, burnishing, and painting; while in the second part they proceed to a detailed technical study of pottery types from phase A (EI II) of Tell Beit Mirsim. This is a study which will prove of great value to all archæologists working in the Palestinian field.

There is room here to refer only to a few of the interesting discoveries in the Iron Age remains of Tell Beit Mirsim. The casemate wall of Phase B (EI I) is a good example of that type of construction which appears to have been introduced into Palestine from Asia Minor via Syria during the late Hittite Empire (1400–1200 B.C.). Many well-preserved private houses were excavated in Tell Beit Mirsim; they were of many types, but one type was particularly notable. It was composed of a large room, flanked by two to four small ones which served as store chambers. Along the axis of the large room were set three or four stone pillars. These pillars, according to Dr. Albright, had a double purpose; they served to strengthen a partition wall and, secondly, they supported the ceiling without cutting off the entrance of sunlight from outside. From the number of loomweights and of dye-plants found, it was concluded that the manufacture and dyeing of textiles were carried on extensively in the town.

The history of Tell Beit Mirsim during the period under review, namely from *c.* 1230 B.C. until the beginning of the sixth century, as illumined by the work of excavation, is interesting. It suffered destruction at the hands of invaders during the second half of the thirteenth century, was almost immediately reoccupied and was destroyed by the Philistines less than a century later. King David fortified it strongly, presumably because of the Philistine menace, but the town seems to have suffered severely during Shishak's invasion towards the end of the tenth century, for phase B of the town's occupation ends then. From this disaster the town seems to have recovered slowly, but in due course it was reconstructed, and it was at the summit of its prosperity during the eighth century. It could not escape during Sennacherib's devastation of the walled cities of Judah in 701 B.C., but thereafter, in spite of varying fortunes, it continued as a centre of population until it went down before the onslaught of Nebuchadnezzar.

Dr. Albright has given us a volume of first-class importance and its value is greatly enhanced by the excellent set of plans, the liberal collection of plates, and, by no means least, the carefully tabulated serial list of Iron Age objects.

J. MAUCHLINE.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

The Rev. Principal William A. Curtis, D.D., D.Litt., D.Theol., delivered the Twenty-first Series of public lectures under the Croall Foundation. He has now published his lectures with the title, *Jesus Christ the Teacher* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). The sub-title describes them as 'A Study of His Method and Message based mainly on the Earlier Gospels.' For a more detailed description of their contents we cannot do better than quote from the publisher's jacket:

'This book is presented in three parts. Part I. explains, in untechnical language, the part played by teaching in the mission of Jesus; His relation to contemporary movements and ideas, the methods and the language which He employed. Part II. collects and outlines the main themes of His teaching: God the Sovereign Father; His Kingdom; The Son of Man and Son of God;

His Mission, Death and Resurrection; Man and his Destiny; The Blessed Life and The Church. Part III. discusses the Teaching as a "Rock Foundation," the Teaching in the Four Records, the Teaching in the Church, and The Teaching, The Church, and The World.'

The first thing that struck us when we handled the book was the popular style in which it is written. Distinguished and richly equipped scholar as Dr. Curtis is, he has not yielded to the temptation of indulging in facile technicalities but has chosen the harder way of untechnical exposition. Yet for him it is not so very hard a way. For his is a ready pen, and he is a master of English style.

One cannot but be impressed by the richness of the vocabulary, the felicity and precision of the phrasing, and the compactness of the sentences, whether they be elaborate or simple in structure. Where the sentences are at once compact and simple, they often fall upon the ear like a rhythmic succession of hammer-strokes. Take this indictment of the Church, the Family of God: 'A family, yet afraid of homeliness and unconventionality. A family, yet at strife. A family, yet incapable of growing up and profiting by experience. A family, yet lacking a common speech, a mutual loyalty, a fellow-feeling, a domestic pride sufficient to make it hush its bickering in face of the outside world of onlookers.'

Obviously too the book is a product of the author's long and loving intimacy with the Gospels and the Bible as a whole. Isaiah, 'the evangelical prophet,' is naturally his favourite among the Old Testament writers; and naturally the Fourth Evangelist is often cited along with the Synoptists, if with critical reserve and discrimination, in the exposition of the Teaching. It is suggested indeed that more could and should be made of the essential affinity between the teaching in the Synoptic Gospels and that in the Fourth Gospel. We remember that an older writer on New Testament Theology, Dr. George B. Stevens, did make a serious attempt in his day to show this essential affinity.

In the field of New Testament criticism Dr. Curtis finds he has little to learn for the purposes of this book from an Albert Schweitzer or a Martin Dibelius. He has listened to their voices but turned again to that essential conservatism from which he has never departed. If he had to identify himself with any 'advanced' school of criticism it would be with the 'liberal' rather than the 'eschatological.' For he maintains that in appropriating the Hebrew terminology of the Theocracy (the coming of the Day of the Lord, etc.) Jesus makes it 'ethical and spiritual throughout, and therefore universal.'

But if in criticism Dr. Curtis is essentially conservative, in theology he appears to take a broad and tolerant standpoint. While he would have us go, not 'back to Christ,' but 'up to Christ,' he would not insist that we must all go 'up' by the same way. 'The riches of Christian doctrine form a store of nourishment to the souls of men, but very simple, very meagre fare drawn from it may suffice the individual believer for health and energy and labour and devotion.' 'As the Bible is bigger than our individual needs, yet not too comprehensive for humanity, so the aggregate of Christian truth expressed in a system of Biblical doctrine belongs to all, yet need not be exacted from each.'

To the Christian teacher or preacher we specially commend Part II., which deals with 'The Themes of the Teaching.' The material has been assembled, arranged, and presented with immense care and masterly skill, and the very numerous textual references given with scrupulous exactitude. With such a book at one's elbow one should be able not only to 'remember the words of the Lord Jesus' but to gain a fresh and vivid conspectus of His mind and purpose.

W. FULTON.

The Chiangs of China, by Dr. Elmer T. Clark (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.00), is a book which is sure of a warm welcome in these days when the heroic Chinese Generalissimo and his talented wife are in the front page of world news. It must be said that the Soongs figure in the book more prominently than the Chiangs. But their story is a most romantic one, and their intimate connexion with America gives an interest which is lacking in the case of Chiang himself. The story is told with freshness and sympathy, and the pages are brightened with a number of excellent photographs.

The Beginning of Christianity, by the Rev. Professor C. T. Craig (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.75), is a very scholarly and comprehensive account of the whole period which covers the writings of the New Testament. The exposition is in five main parts, namely the Background of the Gospel, the Announcement of the Gospel, the Beginnings, the Expansion, and the Consolidation of the Church. It is all eminently readable, a lucid and straightforward narrative, carrying the reader through the life and teaching of Jesus, the ministry of St. Paul, the struggles and problems of the Early Church, and the origin and character of the Apostolic writings. Dr. Craig has a leaning towards Form Criticism, and is perhaps too anxious to maintain the appearance of strict historical impartiality. Jesus is 'represented as doing' or 'is reported to have said.' The repetition of such phrases becomes irritating and casts a subtle air of dubiety over the whole story. Secular historians do not sprinkle their pages so profusely with question marks. But the whole work must be commended as an uncommonly full and stimulating treatment of the vast subject with which it deals.

Mr. Gerald Heard has issued Pamphlet Two of his *Training for the Life of the Spirit* (Cassell; 1s. 6d. net). The series of which it is a number attempts to do two things: first, to describe what life is (maintaining that it is an evolution of consciousness); secondly, to show the kind of conduct

we should accordingly follow. As he has maintained in other writings, physical evolution will now take us no further, and if we would go further, it must be psychologically; and if we would progress psychologically, it must be consciously and by deliberate effort. If Pamphlet One may be said to have dealt with Purgation, Pamphlet Two may be said to deal with Proficiency. 'As the chief activity of Stage One is virtue whereby conduct may be altered for good, so the chief activity of Stage Two is prayer *per se*, or, a more exact term, those spiritual exercises whereby, if the life has already begun to be reordered, character is changed.' In short, the theme of this second pamphlet is the further evolution of character through spiritual exercises. In seeking to outline the life of prayer the writer has, as we must allow, come to his task 'after reading the master charts and experimenting in preliminary seamanship on that vast ocean.' To those who have found help in his expositions of the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes we commend these studies in the 'Life of the Spirit.'

God Matters to You, by Mr. Frederic Greeves (Epworth Press; 6d. net), contains a number of 'Talks broadcast to Isolated Units of H.M. Forces,' here printed as they were spoken. They deal with a variety of topics, such as God, Love, Prayer, Death, which are treated in a conversational and very helpful way. But one wonders whether the things of God can be worthily presented in so very chatty a style.

The Heart and Mind of Jesus (Epworth Press; 2s. net), by the Rev. T. Edmunds, B.A., is an interpretation of chapter fifteen in the Gospel according to St. Luke. It is an interpretation that will repay the patient reader. For it comes from a mind richly stored and in close touch with recent theological literature, especially of the exegetical kind. If the reader be a teacher or preacher he will find here much useful material to hand. But he will have to read patiently, as the treatment is discursive in style, and the author does not—so far as we have observed—indicate the scope of the treatment, much less take us into his confidence as to its order and method. The book is marked throughout by an earnest evangelical tone.

Getting Rid of God?, by the Rev. Frederic C. Spurr (Epworth Press; 1s. 6d. net), is a vigorous piece of writing in which the bankruptcy of the modern social order is exposed. Disbelief in Christian doctrine has been followed by disregard for Christian morality, and now it is painfully evident that the flower, severed from the root, is withering away. The very idea of democracy rests on Christian assumptions without which it cannot permanently maintain itself. The writer's appeal is predominantly to reason and his whole treatment is highly thought-provoking.

Twelve Services of Intercession for Use in War Time, by E. S. B. (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net), were prepared at the request of Canon Peter Green for the dinner-hour service at Manchester Cathedral. They are based on passages of great literature, and Canon Green says that for this reason (coming from different people and ages) the services help us to realize how 'the whole round earth is every way bound by gold chains about the feet of God.' The selection of passages from Scripture and secular literature is admirable, and the prayers are simple and comprehensive. This small book should be a great help to those who have the responsibility of conducting similar devotional services.

A book of devotional essays by a leading American Quaker, Thomas R. Kelly, has been published, with an interesting biography of their author by Mr. Douglas V. Steere—*A Testament of Devotion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. net). Mr. Kelly was a personality tingling with energy, bodily and mental. He was a scholar and very much of a saint. The essays selected by his friend are a great deal more than devotional, in the ordinary sense of that word. They are based on clear and strenuous thinking, and appeal to the mind as well as the heart. The subjects are: The Light Within, Holy Obedience, The Blessed Community, The Eternal Now and Social Concern, and The Simplification of Life.

Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?, by Mr. F. F. Bruce, M.A. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 1s. 6d. net), is a plain yet scholarly treatment of its subject intended for the ordinary reader. The writer is lecturer in Greek in the University of Leeds and he has evidently made a careful study of the relevant literature. While not professing to give anything new or original he gives a very clear statement of the evidences for the authorship and trustworthiness of the New Testament documents, including the evidence of St. Paul and of early Jewish and Gentile writers. He has a specially good chapter on the accuracy of Luke as a historian. The whole makes a very useful handbook for Bible-class study.

The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, B.D., has written a book on the three uses of God's Law under the title, *Christ's Strange Work* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). The phrase of the title occurs in the Formula of Concord, where it is descriptive of the passion and death of Christ as in the first instance exhibiting the wrath of God and terrifying man. The first use of the Law is that by its means God preserves the world, and maintains political order and justice through the institution of civil government. This is called the political use. The second use is as a rod to summon men to repentance. This is called the pædagogic use. The third use is as guidance for those who have been justified by faith but are not yet wholly sanctified. This is the didactic use. All this is set forth by Mr. Vidler with learning and reverence. The Bishop of London, who commends the book in a Foreword, describes it as 'an illuminating and a fortifying

book, very apt to our present needs.' The author himself explains that it is written 'for members of the Church who are anxious to understand more fully the faith that they profess, and who, in trying to understand it, are willing to be sent back constantly to read their Bibles.'

A clergyman who is deeply concerned about the way to Revival and has found it in Fellowship, has written out at some length his discovery in *Christ's Way with People* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 5s. net). The author is the Rev. F. Noel Palmer, M.A., B.D., Vicar of St. Luke's, Brighton, and he is sponsored by the Bishop Suffragan of Warrington. The book is an earnest plea for a kind of fellowship that arises from a better understanding of the individual. We must learn from Christ, from His way with people, and this will lead us into a deeper communion of life whose centre and sustaining power is Christ. One of the most interesting things in this earnest and gracious book is the list of books under each chapter for further reading. The list shows a wide and catholic taste and the books are chosen with judgment. It would not be a bad discipline for any one to read each chapter and then choose from the list one of Mr. Palmer's selection.

A Wayfarer's Psalter, by the Rev. John Macbeath, M.A., D.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 6s. net), is defined in the Foreword as 'an attempt to put in brief and direct form some significant and useful lesson plucked out of the heart of each psalm.' Accordingly a page is given to each psalm, its central message is picked out and aptly commented upon. The book is designed 'for the wayfarer who has not the time nor the opportunity for expository or exegetical studies, but must put his book in his wallet and sally forth to his daily avocation.' The result is a little book of helpful reading, full of aids to faith and devotional stimulus.

Grace and Truth, by the Rev. Ernest Evans, B.D. (Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net), contains a series of addresses delivered to ordination candidates. They are based on the first six chapters of St. John's Gospel and are strictly Biblical expositions. They are at once scholarly and devout. It is the conviction of the writer that preaching loses its power in proportion as it loses contact with the Word, and he would have preachers concentrate on more faithful and spiritual exposition. His own exposition is full of wisdom and ripe Christian experience.

The Triumphs of Faith, by the Rev. G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. (Pickering & Inglis; 5s. net), is a series of studies of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. The writer takes the names of the heroes of the faith there enumerated, from Abel to Rahab, and shows how faith was the inspiration and guiding principle in each life. The number of characters dealt with gives variety and sustained interest to the treatment which is marked by Dr. Campbell Morgan's vivid style and notable skill in Scriptural exposition.

The Bible Speaks to our Day, by Mr. George Barclay (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net), is an excellent little book whose title aptly expresses its theme. It contains a course of seven addresses on Biblical incidents which are shown to carry lessons applicable to the problems of to-day. Some of the subjects are Isaiah and the Hitler of his Day, Idolatry, Reconstruction. In one address on the Citizen a New World Needs the writer very properly insists on what many ardent reformers overlook, that the new order will be found to be unattainable without a new type of citizen. As Lord Bryce put it, 'What we need is a world of new and better men.' Preachers should find these addresses highly suggestive.

A well-informed and thoroughly documented book on Russia, and the religious situation there, has been written by Mr. Paul B. Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). Mr. Anderson knows the ground well and presents the situation frankly, bringing out clearly the differences between West and what may be called East, for only by a clear statement of these divergences can the peoples of the Soviet Union and those of Western Europe be brought to a mutual understanding. The background of this study lies in the teachings of the Christian Church on the one hand and the Marxist philosophy of historical materialism on the other, and it is a curious fact (as Mr. Anderson says) that this Marxist philosophy has not been a bogy to the Christians in Russia but has actually helped their thinking while not threatening their faith. The historical religious development in Russia naturally occupies a large space in this book, for only by grasping this clearly can we understand the present position. This position is in many ways full of hope. It is an entire delusion that religion is at a low ebb in Russia. Both theological thinking and spiritual life are in a vigorous state, and the tyrannous attitude of Soviet leaders in the past is giving way before the loyalty and devotion to the national cause of priests and worshippers.

Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?

By the Reverend T. F. Glasson, M.A., B.D., Newcastle, Staffs.

There is general agreement that the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke were written independently of one another, and that the writers of both made use of St. Mark's Gospel. It is usually taken for granted that they had before them copies of Mark which were textually correct; is this assumption warranted? The following facts are worthy of attention in this connexion:

(1) In the incident 'Sabbath in the Cornfields,' if we examine the three accounts side by side, say in Huck's *Synopsis*, we find that Matthew reproducing Mk 2^{23-28} has omitted *v.*[27] and the beginning of *v.*[28]: 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that.' Luke has done exactly the same. If Matthew and Luke had Mark before them in its present form, it is strange that they should independently make the same omission. (See Mt 12^{1-8} and Lk 6^{1-5}.)

When we turn to Mark in D (*i.e.* the Codex Bezae at Cambridge), our principal Western authority, we discover that the same omission occurs there; *v.*[27] is absent and the word ὥστε of *v.*[28].

(2) Mk $2^{18ff.}$=Mt $9^{14ff.}$=Lk $5^{33ff.}$ On Fasting. Matthew and Luke, though both reproducing the bulk of Mark, both omit [19b] 'as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.' The D of Mark makes exactly the same omission.

(3) Mk 1^{10}. The word used for the opening of the heavens at the Baptism of Jesus is σχιζομενους. In D it is ἠνοιγμενους. In the parallels, Matthew and Luke both use ἀνοιγω. (Mt 3^{16} ἀνεῳχθησαν: Lk 3^{21} ἀνεῳχθηναι.)

(4) Mk $9^{33ff.}$=Mt $18^{1ff.}$=Lk $9^{46ff.}$
In D, Mk 9^{35} is missing apart from the opening words.
Matthew and Luke in their reproduction of Mark both omit the same verse.

Now, a moment's reflection will convince us that the actual autograph of Mark's Gospel was not in the hands of Matthew and Luke; they used copies. We may assume that in the period of twenty years or so between the writing of Mark on the one hand and the writing of Matthew and Luke on the other, mistakes in copying had entered the various MSS. of Mark which were then produced. This period was surely not free from all of the very numerous divergent readings which have come down to us in the MS. tradition. Indeed there is a greater likelihood of mistakes occurring early than in the later days when sacredness and canonicity had become attached to the Marcan story. The supposition that Matthew and Luke had correct copies of Mark before them is most unlikely.

In the coincidences mentioned above, Matthew and Luke differ from Mark in the same way as D in Mark differs from the original reading. (In the cases mentioned, as in those which are to follow, there is little doubt as to what the original reading was. Nor is there much doubt about the original readings of Matthew and Luke, and with respect to them our only concern is with what they originally wrote.) All the facts would be explained if we supposed that Matthew and Luke used copies of Mark which shared a number of corruptions—corruptions which have been retained, with many others of course, in the Western authorities.

There is nothing outrageous in this supposition; it is practically certain that many Western readings, like the mistakes which have been preserved in other branches of the MS. tradition, had their origin in the first century. And the facts suggest that Matthew and Luke had documents of Mark which had in common a number of readings which we now call 'Western.' This theory is a great simplification and has the advantage of explaining a number of coincidences with one reason. Thus in (2) above, the omission of Mk 2^{19b} is most likely due to homoioteleuton. What a remarkable thing that Matthew, Luke, and the scribe who made the original Western blunder, now preserved in the D of Mark, should all independently make the same mistake! The present suggestion is that one man made the mistake, viz. an early copyist of Mark, his mistake was perpetuated in the copies of Mark which Matthew and Luke used, and in the MSS. forming the ancestry of D. On the usual view, which unthinkingly assumes that Matthew and Luke had correct copies of Mark, there is not only the coincidence of three men making the same omission independently; there is the more serious

coincidence that in repeated cases where there is agreement against Mark's original words in (1) Matthew, (2) Luke, and (3) a MS. of Mark, number (3) is D! It is surely incredible that this can be due to chance. The theory now suggested would explain all these phenomena with a single cause.

I may say that I originally set out to find if Matthew's use of Mark could in certain cases help us to decide between variant readings in Mark. I found to my surprise that there were cases in which a Marcan reading which was obviously the wrong one seemed to be reflected in both Matthew and Luke. The fact that in these cases the reading concerned was that of D naturally produced the suggestion we are now discussing.

It is true that some of D's faulty readings in Mark are harmonistic glosses. Matthew was read in the services of the Early Church much more frequently than Mark, and in consequence the language of Matthew occasionally crept into the MSS. of Mark as scribes remembered the familiar wording of the First Gospel. But this factor does not explain those cases where Matthew and Luke agree against the true reading of Mark and agree with the D reading. Again, the process of 'assimilation' just mentioned usually resulted in identical language, the transference of a phrase from Matthew (or Luke) to Mark; but we find instances where the Marcan D has language which differs from both Matthew and Luke and yet language which would account for the feature wherein Matthew and Luke jointly differ from the true reading of Mark.

The passage Mk 9^{33-37} with its parallels (see (4) above) is of great interest. In Mark there are two pericopes here, though our familiarity with Matthew usually blinds us to this. The first is *vv.*$^{33-35}$ and deals with the question, Who is the greatest? Jesus' answer is given in *v.*^{35} and the whole passage *vv.*$^{33-35}$ is a Pronouncement Story. *Vv.*$^{36-37}$ is a different pericope, and it again is a Pronouncement Story:

> 'And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.'

The theme here is Jesus and the Children.

Now, if we turn to Mt 18 we find that the parallel to Mk 9^{34} passes straight on to the parallel with *v.*^{36}. The remarkable thing is that Lk 9 has done the same thing. In both Gospels the passage of Mark (9^{33-37}) is treated as a unity; and Huck's *Synopsis* shows in both a blank by the side of Mk 9^{35}. If we turn next to D, we find that Mk 9^{35} is missing, except for the opening words 'he sat down, and called the twelve.' The answer of Jesus in *v.*^{35} is omitted and we pass straight on to the child. This gives the impression that the answer of Jesus about the question of greatness consists of the object lesson of the child, even though the words of Jesus in *v.*^{37} say nothing about greatness.

If this reading of Mark lay before Matthew and Luke, everything is explained. They both add words which make the apparent object lesson quite explicit: Matthew adds, 'Whoso humbles himself as this little child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (4), and Luke adds at the end, 'For he who is least among you all, he is great' (9^{48}).[1]

(5) Another interesting case is Mk 15^{25}; 'and it was the third hour, and they crucified him.'
D instead of 'crucified him' has 'they were keeping watch on him' (ἐφυλασσον).
Mt 27^{36}, the corresponding passage, has: 'and sitting down they kept watch on him there' (ἐτηρουν).
Lk 23^{35} 'and the people stood beholding.'

C. H. Turner in his commentary on Mark writes:

> '"And they crucified him." But Mark has mentioned that already in 24, and the parallels in Matthew "sitting down they watched him there," and in Luke "the people stood beholding" make it almost certain that they read here in Mark not "they crucified him," but, with the Western authorities, "they kept guard on him."'

He evidently believes that D has here preserved the original text—he is not suggesting that Matthew and Luke used texts which had undergone corruption. In this instance it may well be that D has preserved the original word. In that case, the point may have some bearing on the time of the Crucifixion.

Many Western readings in Mark are, of course, not relevant in the present connexion. For example, in Mk 8^{35} D omits 'for my sake'; but the parallels in Matthew and Luke show that in the copies of Mark which they used, the words 'for my sake' were present. All that is implied by 'Western text' in our title is that some of the readings which we now know as Western were already present in the copies of Mark employed by Matthew and Luke—these MSS. were what may be called early Western, or incipient Western.

Though D belongs to the fifth or sixth century, some of its many corruptions clearly go back to much earlier times. In practically all of the instances mentioned in this article, it has the support of the Old Latin, and this in itself proves that these variants at least are centuries older

[1] Mt 18^{3} is apparently taken from another source and woven into the passage according to Matthew's familiar practice.

than D. Other examples may be given more briefly and it will be sufficient for our present purpose to cite D.

(6) Mk 2^{16} ὅτι μετα των κ.τ.λ.
D διατι--.
Mt 9^{11} διατι--.
Lk 5^{30} διατι.

(7) Mk 2^{23}. D omits ὁδον ποιειν.
So do Mt 12^{1} and Lk 6^{6}.

(8) Mk 4^{10}. In place of 'they that were about him with the twelve'
D has 'his disciples'
Mt 13^{10} 'the disciples'
Lk 8^{9} 'his disciples.'

(9) Mk 4^{10} 'asked him the parables.'
D 'asked him what this parable was' (τίς ἡ παραβολη αὐτη).
Lk 8^{9} 'asked him what this parable might be' (τίς αὐτη εἰη ἡ παραβολη).

If the D reading had been taken from Luke, the actual words would not be different nor Luke's characteristic optative skilfully avoided. This D reading is not therefore to be explained as assimilation to Luke, but if on the contrary it stood in the copy of Mark which Luke used, it would adequately explain his variation. Mt 13^{10} apparently paraphrases and is different from both the original Mark and the D Mark.

(10) Mk 4^{11} 'unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God'
D adds γνωναι . . . *to know* the mystery. . . .
Mt 13^{11} 'unto you it is given *to know* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.'
Lk 8^{10} 'unto you it is given *to know* the mysteries of the kingdom of God.'

(11) Mk 4^{16} 'and these *in like manner* are they that are sown upon the rocky places.'
D omits 'in like manner' (ὁμοιώς).
Mt 13^{20} and Lk 8^{13} both omit 'in like manner.'

(12) Mk 5^{14} ἠλθον.
D ἐξηλθον.
Mt 13^{34} ἐξηλθεν,
Lk 8^{35} ἐξηλθον.

(13) Mk 8^{27} λεγων αὐτοις.
D has λεγων without αὐτοις.
Mt 16^{13} and Lk 9^{18} have λεγων without αὐτοις.

(14) Mk 9^{3} 'such as no fuller on earth could whiten them.'
These words are omitted by Mt (17^{2}) and Lk (9^{29}).
The D of Mark omits 'fuller' making the whole phrase pointless—hence its omission by Matthew and Luke.

15) Mk 10^{24-25}. *V.*^{24} 'And the disciples were amazed at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God.'
(*V.*^{25}) 'It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.'

There is nothing corresponding to *v.*^{24} in Mt 19 or Lk 18. This verse (24) is not missing from Mark in D, but it is misplaced, *v.*^{24} and *v.*^{25} being inverted. Thus in D, *v.*^{23} is followed by *v.*^{25} and this corresponds to the sequence in Matthew and Luke. Misplacements are often a sign that words have first been omitted and have later been inserted in the wrong place. Thus it is very likely that in an ancestor of D *v.*^{24} was absent.

(16) Mk 10^{27} 'with men it is impossible but not with God:
for all things are possible with God.'
D παρα ἀνθρωποις τουτο ἀδυνατον ἐστιν, παρα δε τῳ θεῳ δυνατον.
'With men this is impossible but it is possible with God.'
Lk 18^{27} 'The things which are impossible with men are possible with God.'
Mt 19^{26} 'With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.'

It will be noticed that D, Luke and Matthew agree in the omission of 'but not with God,' and that all three have 'with God' once, while the original Mark has it twice.

(17) Mk 12^{7}. D omits ἐκεινοι. So do Mt 21^{38} and Lk 20^{14}.

(18) Mk 14^{48}. D omits ἀποκριθεις. So do Mt 26^{55} and Lk 22^{52}.

(19) Mk 15^{15}. D omits 'wishing to satisfy the crowd.' So do Mt 27^{27} and Lk 23^{24}.

(20) Mk 15^{24} βαλλοντες κληρον ἐπ' αὐτα τίς τί ἀρῃ.
D βαλλοντες κληρον ἐπ' αὐτα.
Mt 27^{35} βαλοντες κληρον.
Lk 23^{34} ἐβαλον κληρους.

If the argument of the foregoing is sound, it is to be expected that there are other cases where Matthew and Mark alone are concerned. There is much more of Mark reproduced in Matthew than in Luke. In the following cases, the D reading of Mark agrees with Matthew, but Luke has either omitted the whole passage of Mark concerned, or he has paraphrased or compressed the passage in such a way that we cannot be sure of the reading which lay before him. It must be remembered that in describing events reported in Mark, Luke sometimes follows another source (as in most of the Passion Story).

It is, of course, much harder to disprove assimila-

tion in the following cases than in the earlier instances. It is probable that some of the D readings are due to later scribes bringing the text of Mark into line with that of Matthew. But two observations may be made about this: (*a*) Once again there are cases where the Marcan D has a different word from that used by Matthew, yet a word which would nevertheless account for the latter. *E.g.* see Mk 11^{22} below (30). (*b*) Some of the agreements are in trivial points to which a scribe would surely be indifferent. We can understand him bringing the Marcan version of some well-known saying of Jesus into agreement with the Matthæan form, for the latter would be familiar through constant quotation. But many of the cases mentioned here cannot be thus explained and seem to require another reason.

(21) Mk 3^{35} ἀδελφος μου.
D μου ἀδελφος.
Mt 12^{50} μου ἀδελφος.

(22) Mk 4^{11} 'all things are *done* in parables,' γινεται.
D . . . are *spoken* λεγεται.
Mt 13^{13} 'therefore *speak* I (λαλω) to them in parables.'

(23) Mk 5^{1} 'and they came to the other side of the sea.'
D 'and they came to the other side.'
Mt 8^{28} 'and when he was come to the other side.'

(24) Mk 6^{44}. D omits 'the loaves' as does Mt 14^{21}. The reading of D is not due to assimilation to Matthew, for the phrase has clearly not been taken from Matthew.

(25) Mk 6^{47} 'the ship was in the midst of the sea.'
D, 'the ship was παλαι in the midst of the sea.'
Mt 14^{24} 'the ship was ἠδη in the midst of the sea.'

Here the D reading cannot be explained as an assimilation to Matthew, but if it lay before Matthew it would explain his word.

(26) Mk 6^{53}. D omits 'and moored to the shore.'
Mt 14^{34} makes the same omission.

(27) Mk 8^{4} 'here in a desert place.'
D omits 'here'; Mt 15^{33} omits 'here.'

(28) Mk 10^{6}. D omits κτισεως and adds και ειπεν.

This agrees with Mt 19^{4-5} and is probably due to later assimilation. But assimilation hardly explains the following verse:

(29) Mk 10^{7}. D adds προσκολληθησεται προς την γυναικα αὐτου.
Mt 19^{5} adds κολληθησεται τῃ γυναικι αὐτου.

D is supported (though not exactly) by A and C. Where an incorrect reading of D is supported by one or more non-Western authorities, it is almost certain that the corruption was a very early one.

(30) Mk 11^{22} ἐχετε πιστιν θεου.
D has εἰ ἐχετε πιστιν--.

This would account for Matthew's parallel: ἐαν ἐχητε πιστιν (21^{21}). It is much more likely that the D reading stood in Matthew's copy of Mark than that it is due to later assimilation. The Marcan D is in fact not assimilated to Matthew.

(31) Mk 13^{19}. D omits 'which God created' as does Mt 24^{21}.

(32) Mk 14^{3}. D omits ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους. Mt 26^{7} omits ναρδου πιστικης.

(33) Mk 14^{12} οἱ μαθηται αὐτου. D and Mt 26^{17} omit αὐτου.

(34) Mk 14^{30}. D omits 'twice' in connexion with the cock crowing. So does Mt 26^{34}.

(35) Mk 14^{71} οὐκ οἰδα τον ἀνθρωπον τουτον ὀν λεγετε.
D omits τουτον.
Mt 26^{74} οὐκ οἰδα τον ἀνθρωπον.

(36) Mk 15^{12} 'Pilate again answered and said to them.'
D omits 'again.'
Mt 27^{21} 'the governor answered and said to them.'

(37) Mk 16^{6} ἰδε ὁ τοπος ὁπου--.
D ἰδετε ἐκει τοπον αὐτου ὁπου--.
Mt 28^{6} ἰδετε τον τοπον ὁπου--.

The following are probably due to assimilation and have not been included above: Mk 3^{18} Thaddæus (D and Mt 10^{3} Lebbæus); Mk 11^{8}, D and Mt 21^{8} have 'trees' for 'fields' and add 'and strewed them in the way.'

Mk 12^{28}. D and Mt 22^{36} add 'Master.'
Mk 14^{1}. D and Mt 26^{2} omit 'and the unleavened bread.'

Some of those cited earlier are possibly due to assimilation, but this cannot be the explanation in every case. Nevertheless, Nos. 21–37 are not as important as 1–20, the instances where both Matthew and Luke agree with the D reading of Mark.

The hypothesis we have been discussing, which is not given dogmatically but as a suggestive line of inquiry, has some bearing upon one of the minor phases of the Synoptic Problem. Every student of the problem is puzzled by those passages where, although Mark appears to be the source, Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. (Lists of some of these agreements may be found in Hawkins's *Horæ Synopticæ*, Appendix B to Part III; Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*, ch. 2; Streeter's *Four Gospels*, ch. 11; and E. A. Abbott's *Corrections of Mark adopted by*

Matthew and Luke.) Sanday suggested, mainly in reference to Abbott's list, that the agreements were due to a recension or deliberate revision of the text of Mark different from that from which all the extant MSS. of the Gospel are derived. But this does not appear to be necessary; and it would only account for those agreements which consist of corrections and would still leave a large number unexplained. Three factors must be taken into account in explaining these agreements:

1. Some are due to the overlapping of Mark and Q (see Streeter, ch. 11).

2. Others are to be explained as corrections and alterations such as would occur independently to different writers (Streeter, ch. 11).

To these it seems we must now add:

3. The use by Matthew and Luke of copies of Mark in which the same corruptions occurred—corruptions which have been transmitted to us in the Western MS. tradition.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Armour of God.

By the Reverend N. H. G. Robinson, B.D., Fraserburgh.

'Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day.'—Eph 6^{13}.

Nowadays, especially in war-time, most boys and girls glance occasionally at the newspapers; and I expect that most of you have noticed the great number of advertisements that are appearing at the present time. That of course is a very strange thing, for goods are much more scarce now than they were before the war. But there is one kind of advertisement which is even more surprising, an advertisement for things you cannot get meantime.

It may be an advertisement for some famous brand of chocolate, and, if it is, it will tell you many of the good points about this particular kind of chocolate. It will tell you at some length how nice it is to taste these chocolates, and then when it has persuaded you that quite the best thing to do is to go and buy a box of them at once, it frankly admits that you cannot possibly get these chocolates just now, that in fact you will not get them again until after the war!

Now that looks like a practical joke, doesn't it? But it is really a very wise thing for these manufacturers to do, for they know that our memories are short, that if they don't keep reminding us of their famous products during these years when we cannot get them, we shall have forgotten all about them when they appear on the market again, and we shall not be able to tell which are the good brands and which are not.

Now something like that is true of Christianity. Some parts of it we cannot understand while we are still girls and boys. Some parts of it puzzle us. Other parts do not seem very important. Yet, we learn these parts in Sunday School, in Bible Class, and in Church.

Why? Simply because, although we cannot use them now, if we get to know them now we shall be able to use them later on.

Some time ago on the wireless there was broadcast a meeting of the Brains Trust, and one of the questions that evening was this: What is the use of teaching boys and girls about religion? One member of the Brains Trust said one thing, and another said something else, until it came to one man who said something like this: 'When I was a boy I didn't see why I had to learn the twenty-third psalm and all the rest of the things that I learned from my mother and at my Sunday School. But since I became a man I have many times been greatly helped simply because I knew and remembered these things. Often when I have been in trouble I have repeated the twenty-third psalm to myself, and I have been able to face up to the trouble and meet it bravely.'

Now, as I listened to that, I was reminded of another man. His name was Sir Henry Newbolt, and he once wrote a poem to his son about the Chapel of his old school. 'Clifton Chapel' the poem was called, and this is what it said:

'This is the Chapel: here, my son,
Your father thought the thoughts of youth,
And heard the words that one by one
The touch of Life has turned to truth.'

You see the point, don't you? And what would you say of a soldier who, while still in this country, threw away his rifle and his helmet simply because he saw no use for them at the present moment? Isn't Paul much more sensible when he says to us: 'Wherefore take unto you the *whole* armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand'?

Wallace the Worm.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'The weak things of the world.'—1 Co 1^{27} (R.V.).

A short time ago when in Stirling I saw in a bookshop a book with the amusing title, *Wallace the Worm*. Wallace, I imagine, with such a name

would be a bold worm. Anyhow it was a suitable name for a worm in Stirling, where William Wallace won the Battle of Stirling Bridge. Although I've no idea what Wallace the worm's story was, there are one or two lessons worth learning about worms as a whole.

One thing to be learned, then, is not to despise the worm because it is on a lower level than we are. Sometimes we are inclined to scorn it as a creepy, crawly thing. Indeed one of the most insulting things we can say about any one is to call him or her 'a worm.' I'm not so sure that the insult isn't on occasion to the worm.

Recently, it is said, there was a meeting of the animals about this and suchlike matters at which various resolutions were passed, and it was, for instance, unanimously agreed that the phrase 'Fighting like wild beasts' should be altered to 'Fighting like human beings.' For, after all, the wild beasts' doings aren't half as bad as some of the deeds being done by men to-day. Similarly the worm isn't a miserable creature at all, not nearly as miserable as some of those who are sometimes called by its name.

As a matter of fact the Apostle Peter long ago was taught a similar sort of lesson. Peter used to despise certain creatures till one day Peter dreamed a dream, for God sometimes gets truth through to us in that way. In the dream Peter saw something like an enormous sheet let down from above and in it all sorts of four-footed beasts of the earth and fowls of the air and creeping things, which Peter called common or unclean. Whereupon a voice seemed to say to him, 'What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.' And that surely applies to the worms that creep, and that God the Creator created as well as us.

And this is another lesson to learn, that worms though little may accomplish a lot. After all, the worm is one of the world's workers. A garden would soon be a bare and infertile place but for the patient boring of the worms. It is the insignificant worm that loosens the soil and aerates it, that is, lets air in.

An American doctor, who was an enthusiastic gardener, experimented with worms to see whether they would enrich the soil and make his plants grow, and he found that his garden flourished as never before, and that the flowers were not nearly so much pestered by insects; whereupon he gave up his doctoring and started as an earthworm farmer instead. He began breeding millions of worms. He then sent them to farmers all over the States, many of whom are deeply grateful to this clever man, for when their land was worked out the lowly earthworm gave it new vitality and saved the day.

And, like the wonderful work of the little worm, it is often men and women of no great stature who have done glorious deeds and shaped history. David was only a stripling shepherd, but it was David, not the giant Goliath, who won the battle, St. Paul, it is believed, was a small man, but no single person accomplished a greater work for God. William Wilberforce was so tiny that they called him a 'shrimp' and had to stand him on a table to see him above the crowd when he was speaking: but it was his brave work that set free thousands of slaves. And when Abraham Lincoln, who was lanky and tall, met Mrs. Stowe, who wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, he looked with surprise at her and said, 'Is this the little woman that made this big war?'—the Civil War by which the slaves in America were freed. Thus, like the insignificant worm, little folk may do a great work for God in His world, for frequently God has 'chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty.'

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Easter.

Life's Responsibility—Instruments or Partners?

By the Reverend Stewart Mechie, M.A., Edinburgh.

'I girded thee, though thou hast not known me.'—Is 45^5.

Doubtless the court chronicler of Cyrus the Persian would have laughed a loud and scornful laugh if he had heard this word from Isaiah. His master, Cyrus the great conqueror, an unwitting instrument in the hand of an obscure deity worshipped by an insignificant people called the Jews! Quite absurd! We have here a notable instance of the contrast between the Biblical and the secular view of history. To the secular historian Cyrus is a man of outstanding ability, who, beginning as the prince of a small territory at the head of the Persian gulf, brought all Western Asia under his sway and organized an empire not unworthy to be compared with the empire of Rome itself. The fact that Cyrus, when he captured Babylon, found Jewish exiles there and set them free to return and rebuild Jerusalem is to the secular historian merely incidental, just one out of dozens of items of policy that engaged the conqueror's attention. But to the Biblical writer it was for this very thing that Cyrus was raised up. Isaiah realizes, of course, that Cyrus did not think so. Cyrus no doubt had his own ends to serve in freeing the Jews. He did not in the least understand that in this action he was fulfilling his destiny and taking his place as the instrument of the Divine purpose for the Jews and for the whole world. Yet that is how Isaiah regards the matter, and who shall say that Isaiah was wrong? After all, happenings are infinite in number. Countless billions of events are taking place every day. History can never be the accumulation of all the facts; it must always be the selection and interpretation of the facts. Who shall say that the interpretation of the career of Cyrus given by the secular historian is sounder than the interpretation declared by the prophet? Moreover, Isaiah is sure that this is not his own interpretation merely; it is God's. 'I girded thee,' says the Almighty to Cyrus, 'though thou hast not known me.'

1. *God makes use of very unexpected instruments.* Cyrus is the only man outside the people of Israel to be called the Lord's Shepherd and the Lord's

Anointed. That is a surprising and significant fact, for Cyrus had no religious qualifications for these titles. The extant Cylinder of Cyrus makes it clear that he was not even a monotheist, but an idolater to whom the God of Israel must say, 'thou hast not known me.' What, then, of his moral qualifications? Greek literature gives a very favourable account of Cyrus, and his achievements suggest that there must have been elements of moral worth in his character; but in all that Isaiah says of him there is no word of this. He is not said to have been chosen for his character's sake. He appears in the Bible not as a character but as an instrument. If he is the Lord's Anointed it is simply because he has the qualities of an instrument and God has chosen him as such. No wonder this message of the prophet evoked objections from his Jewish hearers. Was not the deliverer of the exiled Jews to spring from the royal house of David? Indeed was not the deliverance to come by miracle, by the Lord's making bare His arm and leading the chosen people forth as in the days of the flight from Egypt? No, says the Almighty by the mouth of Isaiah, I have made the earth and stretched out the heavens and I have also raised up Cyrus. It is not for you to question my methods or object to my instruments. That is the point of verses 9 to 13 of this chapter. God is sovereign over all. No man can question His ways. Even the most unexpected person, even an idolater like Cyrus the Persian, may be the Lord's Anointed. Serving his own designs he is really fulfilling God's plan. 'I girded thee, though thou hast not known me.'

2. *Every man is at least God's instrument.* If Cyrus the Persian can be God's instrument, there is no man anywhere who is not God's instrument. Isaiah does not say so in so many words, but his large doctrine of Divine sovereignty and providence implies it. A great theologian puts the point in a startling way—'All alike are God's instruments. By no desire of evil or doing wickedness with both hands can we prevent God from using us.' Whether we will it or not, whether we are good, bad, or indifferent, He uses us. Even those who seem most to be working against God can be used of God, for He makes even the wrath of man to praise Him. Even those who are working for their own ends may be all the time unwitting instruments of God for His ends. Most of us would accept that as a possible interpretation of the career of Napoleon. Perhaps we may even surmise that it provides a probable interpretation of the career of Hitler. The Bible, at any rate, encourages us to think so; and it is good to remember that when our hearts fail us and we fear that chaos is over all. Not so; God is sovereign. He uses all men as His instruments. That is an exercise of His might that no man can prevent.

3. *God wants every man not as an instrument but as a partner.* Instruments are blind, unconscious things, and when they are done with they are cast aside. God has made us capable of more than that. He wants us to work with Him, to know His will and His purpose in some measure at least, to use our minds and our strength for Him and to abide in His fellowship for ever. So the important question is not whether God will use us or not. He will: but in what capacity—as instruments or as partners? That is the choice that is presented to us, that is the responsibility that life itself imposes.

Think of a violin in the hands of a player, and then think of that player himself taking his place in an orchestra under the command and inspiration of a great conductor. The one is a mere instrument, the other, however humble, is a partner. God will certainly use us somehow. Our motives and our acts may be mean, they may be godless, they may be positively wicked; but He will use us and them. We cannot escape from being His instruments. He will gird us though we do not know Him, yes, though we set ourselves against Him. But that is a negative, an indirect use, and God wants more than that. He has made us for more than that; and He can use us more if we want to be so used, if we put ourselves at His disposal and are willing to share His purposes. No doubt in the end He will have His way, with us or without us or against us, or rather He will have His way using us even against our will; but how terrible to be used of Him only as He used Judas and Pilate and the chief priests. How much more glorious and satisfying, not to say honouring to Him, is it to hear and accept His Word in Jesus Christ, to listen daily for His whispers and to learn to share His purposes. So alone shall we accept aright the responsibility that the gift of life lays upon us, and by grateful response to His high calling become not instruments but partners of the Highest.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Life a Long Emmaus Walk.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU.

'And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?'—Lk 24^{32}.

This is one of the stories of which we never tire. Nothing can stale the infinite freshness of it. It has perennial youth. Why is this so? It may be said, in answer, that the whole setting is dramatic, with the attractive feature of the unknown stranger in it: the language is beautiful and simple. Then, again, Luke is the very soul of sincerity. He never tries to gloze over the doubts and fears and ignorance of the two friends who walked to Emmaus. All these things, however, only partly account for the popularity of the story. They leave out the true and deepest explanation.

The real reason why this incident has such a large place in our affections is this, that we feel sure that the experiences of Cleopas and his friend bear a very close resemblance to our own, as we journey through life. If so be the living Christ is with us, our human life may be like a long Emmaus pilgrimage in its inner moral and spiritual aspects.

Take away the particular geographical setting, put away for the moment the special historical background and I believe that we have here essentially an epitome of the kind of things that may happen to us, if we, too, have eyes to recognize and faith to apprehend the Risen Christ and keep ever in His fellowship. For Faith has still its Olivet and Love its Galilee and Joy its Emmaus.

Let me illustrate that idea for a little now. Emmaus in its spiritual significance may be reproduced in our own lives. The believing heart has always and everywhere its Holy Land. What, then, are those elements in the incident which make us exclaim: 'I, too, have experienced that. This is just what I have often felt and known?'

To begin with, these two friends were disappointed and grief-stricken men. They had seen in Jesus the fulfilment of sacred prophecy. They had counted on Him as the mighty Deliverer from servitude and shame. But now this Jesus who had been the light of all their seeing had been put to death on a cross outside the city. As they walked they talked; and it was about the tragedy of the Cross that they were conversing together, as they plodded stolidly along the road. It was a sorrowful way for them. Their hopes had been shattered. Their King had been slain. The Kingdom seemed at an end.

Then came the mysterious Stranger. Had He been an ordinary countryman they might have resented His presence. But His first word unlocked the door of their troubled hearts. He knew in a trice that they were depressed and sad and He knew also the reason. With what mingled candour and thoughtfulness He questioned them, with what tenderness He accommodated Himself to their ignorance! Little by little, and with matchless compassion, He who was the centre of the tragedy not only comforted them but instructed them in the light of the Word of Prophecy. When with a sob in their voices they cried: 'We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel,' He gave them a new viewpoint, taught them that 'the path of love and duty may lead to a cross and the reward of faithfulness be a crown of thorns.' God Himself was overruling the tragedy for a higher end which was for them at the moment out of sight.

How many millions are there to-day treading the sorrowful way, men and women, who in their sorrow find their belief in the sovereignty of righteousness and the inherent goodness of human nature strained to the breaking-point. Their minds are, perchance, confused and rebellious, as they read of the ghastly deeds and the poisoned passions that have turned this world of ours into a colossal charnel-house. No glib conventional word of comfort can heal the wounded heart. Only some great word of Christ's can do it, only a great assurance from the very heart of God Himself that somehow—we know not how exactly—in spite of the madness of men, He is working out His own invincible purposes of Love. For the bereaved heart there is vouchsafed also the relief of telling its agony to Jesus; and that will enable it to hear His voice and His private word of sympathy. The Cross may not be lifted but it will certainly be transformed and transfigured. It is a great victory for the children of sorrow when they are brought to receive this word, even though it be with many a heartache and many a tear, that 'Disappointment is His Appointment.'

Then it is helpful to notice the quiet, unobtrusive way in which that light came to their darkened souls. These two friends were so engrossed with the Lord's conversation that they scarcely realized how quickly they had covered the ground between Jerusalem and their destination. They had found in His words such a wealth of spiritual comfort that they suddenly woke up to the fact that they could not part with Him. They had arrived at their cottage by the roadside, the sun was sinking fast and soon the darkness would come on without any warning. But the Lord 'made as though he would have gone further.' It was unthinkable, however, that He should leave them like this, for they had so many things to ask Him, so much more light to receive from His words. So they pleaded with Him to stay with them, to come in and share the hospitality of their humble home. 'Abide with us: for it is toward evening.'

Christ would not turn a deaf ear to entreaty like this. He went in and revealed to them more and more of what He was. True, He seemed bent on going on, but His chief desire was to awaken in them more ardent desires towards Himself and to arouse deeper faith and a more potent love. That was His way of drawing them closer to His side, that He might make it possible for them and Himself to become intimate friends.

Now is not this Christ's method still? Is not this the more usual way of Divine self-disclosure? We shall be disappointed if we expect on the common road of life dreams and ecstasies and the sudden opening of the skies. Christ, we know, respects human personality. He does not believe in any gate-crashing of men's souls. What we get is not thunder, earthquake, or fire, but a still small voice—a whisper of divinest humility. What we get in life is no mathematical proof that annihilates all doubt or denial of Himself. But in the silent hour of meditation, He offers Himself to us in the stray suggestion of an old hymn, or in some wistful, almost fugitive presentation of His heart of love, so gentle that we might let Him go further on, if our eyes were not fully opened.

Then this story tells us, that when we do invite Christ into our hearts our hearts are filled with joy and hope. We are told that when Christ went into the cottage the wonderful thing happened. As though He were the host, He took up the bread lying on the board, and blessed it and breaking it into portions handed it to the two friends. Then He vanished, but, as they looked back on the scene, there arose from the depths of their consciousness the sense of a wonderful red glow of fire in their heart. It was an experience which made of their twain hearts one. 'Was not our *heart* burning within us, while He talked with us.' In fellowship with the living Christ, two hearts beat as one. Their heart was, like John Wesley's, 'strangely warmed.'

The all-important and primary thing is that we should invite Him in. He is ready to enter at the least gesture of hospitality. Is this not true to everyday life? When you go to the house of a friend, you may say to yourself, as you approach the door, 'If he really wishes me to go in, I will go in, but if he obviously does not wish it, I will go on.' But when He enters, He brings us gifts of joy and hope.

What does Christ actually mean to you? Is He merely the Christ of theology or the Christ of experience? He knows that you are trudging along a very hard road. You need your faith deepened and your love renewed. This Divine wayfarer is the Christ of every road and of every soul that needs Him. If you are disappointed, He will help you to bear your disappointment. If you are bewildered, He will enlighten you. If you are sorrowful, He will comfort you. If you are an hungered, He will break to you the Bread of Life. He will make the so-called common meal an hour of joyful fellowship. If you have suffered the loss of your dearest, He will be to you the Resurrection and the Life. Have you arrived at the evening-time of life and are the shadows on the road of your life long and heavy? He is light in darkness, yea, even in the valley of the shadow of death.

He is a path, if any be misled;
He is a robe, if any naked be;
If any chance to hunger, He is bread;
If any be but weak, how strong is He!
To dead men, life He is; to sick men, health;
To blind men, sight; and to the needy, wealth;
A pleasure without loss; a treasure without stealth.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Loneliness of Christ.

'And they all forsook him, and fled.'—Mk 14^{50}.

There is no aspect of the Master's life more impressive and more solemnizing than its increasing loneliness. The supporting companionships of men are withdrawn one by one from Him. As the end approaches a wider and wider space seems to clear about Him until there is left only the gaunt and dreadful isolation of the Cross. There is a certain symbolism in the fact that they left Him to die on the summit of a hill so that our last vision of Him is against the background of the empty sky. It represents physically the climax of spiritual isolation. Even in the most intimate circle of His own disciples He was deeply and austerely conscious of it. 'Behold the hour cometh, yea is now come, that ye shall be scattered, and shall leave me alone.'

It is well to think for a little about this loneliness of Jesus.

And the first thing to be said is that we must be careful not to misinterpret or minimize it, pulling it down to our level.

It would be easy, for example, especially if we are of a certain temperament, to allow ourselves to grow a trifle pathetic and pitiful about Christ's loneliness. We might draw a most moving picture of a spirit hungry for love, for companionship, for human sympathy and appreciation and support, and yet receiving nothing but misunderstanding and treachery and hate; we might even succeed in working ourselves up to the point almost of tearfulness about it. I read these words recently in a religious book: 'In all the *pathos* of the Gospel story there is nothing so infinitely *touching* as the ever-increasing loneliness of Christ.' Pathos! Touching! I do not like the words. I set against them F. W. Robertson's protest in his famous sermon on this same subject: 'There is a feeble and sentimental way in which we speak of Christ. We turn to the Cross, the agony, and the loneliness, to touch the softer feelings, to arouse compassion. You degrade that loneliness by your compassion. Compassion, compassion for Him! Adore if you will, but no pity.'

The danger is that when we pity Christ in His loneliness we merely project into Him something of our own disordered feelings. Our pity for Him, if we are not very careful, is simply a disguised pity for ourselves. It is ourselves over whom we are growing tearful; down in the subtle, subconscious places of the mind we have presumed to see in this tremendous Christ a companion in distress with ourselves. But I do know that, whatever the sublime personality of Christ was meant for, it was not meant for pity. If you pity Christ you are not seeing Him. And if you are not seeing Him, what is standing in the way but your own clouded and self-projective mind? No, we must not call Christ's loneliness pathetic.

But again, if we must not pity Jesus in His loneliness, equally much we must not go to the other extreme and read it in terms of an unnaturally hard and iron strength. To do that is also to project into Him the fundamental weakness and stupidity of our own characters. The strong, silent man, who asks no counsel and craves no sympathy, who in stern self-reliance can endure without flinching the loss of every tender joy of human love and human companionship, is a pure fantasy creation of our weak and cringing and dependent minds, and finds his most appropriate place in the penny novelette. He could not exist. Or, if he did exist, he would be utterly inhuman, and therefore in the end, despite his appearance of strength, utterly weak. Let us not picture the loneliness of Christ in such terms. There would be absent from it what from beginning to end is the most amazing and distinctive thing in Jesus, His piercing and profound love for men.

There is still another way in which we might minimize the loneliness of Jesus. There is a sense, of course, in which loneliness is an essential element in every deep and developing spiritual and religious life. God's voice in the soul is always a profoundly personal and individual thing and it always in some measure detaches and isolates a man from his fellows. It is one condition of hearing God speak that you *must* stop listening to men, you must be willing in some sense to be *by*

yourself and act *for* yourself. That there was this kind of deep, essential loneliness in the experience of the Master is certain. He who was nearest of all to the heart of God must again and again, in prayer and thought and moral choice, have passed into remote and holy solitudes where He was alone with God and whither we cannot follow. One thinks of those long nights spent in prayer on the hill-tops. What happened in them? We can never know. Yet though Jesus knew solitariness, as every deeply religious mind must know it, plainly there is more than that in this isolation of which we speak and which reached its climax in the Cross. We must not thus merely subsume it under a quite general law of religious experience. To do that is to minimize it, for there is something utterly unique in it, as unique as Jesus Himself.

We have not understood the loneliness of Christ until we see in it an essential part of the deepest agony of His Cross, until we see therefore in His acceptance of it a dazzling and overwhelming revelation of the depth and purity and austerity of His love.

But if we are to see that, it is necessary to have purer ideas of love. It is necessary to ask what is the really central and essential impulse and desire of love at its deepest and truest and best. The answer is, that it is the impulse towards, the desire for, fellowship, for community of life and mind and purpose, for mutual sympathy and understanding and affection and co-operation without any shadow of estrangement or dislike or distrust or self-seeking coming between. In other words, it is towards the direct and polar opposite of loneliness and isolation. This is often overlooked. People sometimes speak as though the chief impulse in love is merely to give, to bestow; it is not. Just as deep is the impulse to receive, to share, the impulse towards mutuality, fellowship. It wants to be given to as well as to give.

Now if this be so and if there was in Jesus the purest spirit of love to men, then it follows that the increasing loneliness and isolation of His life was an increasing sorrow and agony all the time. Being what He was, He could not take refuge in merely stoical indifference. McLeod Campbell was assuredly right when he said many years ago that the chief element in the sufferings of Christ was not physical, but was intimately bound up with the attitudes of men to Himself. Our Lord, he says, being a true brother of every man, desired the response of brotherliness from the heart of every man, and the refusal of it, the giving of contempt instead of favour, and scorn and misunderstanding instead of appreciation and accord was as death to Him. It was like a moral and spiritual and emotional suffocation.

And yet it was all endured. Why? Here from another angle appears the amazing strength and purity of Christ's love, its Godlikeness. It is clear even from our poor and thin experience, that love meets its most searching test when it is faced with the necessity of deeply estranging the one loved in order to bless him. When love is crying out for fellowship it is the hardest thing in the world deliberately to pursue a course which you know will for the time being destroy it. Yet sometimes it *is* necessary. Jesus wanted these men's fellowship with Himself, wanted it more than our egotistic natures can ever conceive, but He knew that there was one thing He must not do to purchase it and that was to tamper with the truth.

As I see Jesus in those lonely, lonely, last days, as I watch the venomous dislike of the Sadducees darting at Him, the coarse brutality of the soldiers scourging Him, the feeble treachery of the crowds shouting 'Crucify him,' the arms outstretched, the nails being driven in, and as I try to realize what it means to say that He loved all these people with perfect brotherly love, I am amazed and humbled again by His strength and austerity. I am amazed—it is so utterly beyond my own soul—that He could still so austerely hold to the course which provoked it all, in order to open their eyes to themselves and to God. He might have said: 'I can do nothing for them unless I keep their love and friendship; let Me therefore at any cost keep that.' But He did not. And I bow my head as in the presence of the Love of God itself.

We speak often—it is right to speak often—of the austerity of the Love of God. But when we thus speak, we think first, and perhaps all the time, of His austerity with us. Yet there is another side to that austerity and without some vision of it the specifically Christian revelation and gospel are not complete. It is God's frightful austerity with Himself.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Truth.

BY THE REVEREND CHANCELLOR C. T. DIMONT, M.A., D.D., SALISBURY.

'Speaking the truth in love.'—Eph 4^{15}.

Nothing can be more certain than that if the peace for which we are longing is to be an abiding peace it must rest upon truthfulness, faithfulness to pledges, as one of its sure foundations. If we would learn how private and public truthfulness are linked together let us read the tale of the progress of lying given to us by the prophet Jeremiah. He shows us first the breaking of promises solemnly made to God. In his youth he had heard his fellow-countrymen pledge themselves to be faithful to God, after they had listened to Josiah reading in Deuteronomy the mercies offered by God to those who serve Him. Jeremiah lived to see his people playing false by returning to the worship of idols, and the foul living which resulted from it. Next, the prophet has to deplore the lying which poisoned the ordinary dealings of neighbour with neighbour. 'My people,' he cries, 'are an assembly of treacherous men.' This was signally proved at a moment of national crisis. The army of the king of Babylon was threatening the city. Jeremiah called for national penitence, and demanded that one of the marks of it should be seen in the freeing of poor Hebrews enslaved by

[1] H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 189.

the rich. The masters vowed to do this, but only to cancel the vow when the danger was past. One more chapter remained in this history of falseness. Jehoiakim swore allegiance to Nebuchadrezzar, but broke his oath at the first convenient opportunity. Jerusalem, false first to its God, then to itself, now had only treachery for its international obligations. In the heathen world lying was, and is, accounted to be lawful and no vice. So one of the first things which the Christian convert had to learn was the duty of telling the truth, 'Putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour' (Eph 4^{25}). It is impossible for any man to be the disciple of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, unless he himself is true both in word and in deed. Our Lord pointed to Satan as the source of all falseness. 'He is a liar, and the father thereof.' Is not that the outstanding thing in the old story of the Fall? There the tempter lies about the character of God, and about the duty of man.

How do we stand to-day? We British have long been accustomed to pride ourselves on our reputation for straightness, and perhaps to be critical of other nations about this. But is all well with us now? Those who have a large experience tell us that it is not, and that respect for speaking the truth has sadly decayed amongst us. There are disquieting signs of this. Dishonesty, which rests upon falsehood, has been increasing. To leave a bicycle untended in the street is often to risk the loss of it. Shopkeepers, especially those who retail clothes, have to take elaborate precautions to stop pilfering. On the wider stage obligations solemnly accepted are lightly thrown aside. Young people going to be married are heard to say that, if they are not satisfied with each other, they can soon get a divorce. The addition of three new judges to the Bench in the Divorce Court bears its own witness to the shaken foundations of truth.

Or again, what of the commercial world? Thank God for the thousands of men and women who strive to conduct their business scrupulously, and would rather lose money than deceive. But such have often to tell us of the hardness of competing with others who are far less honest. And it is worth noting how often writers on the morals of to-day comment on the carelessness about truth in much contemporary advertising. Herbert Agar in his striking book, *A Time for Greatness*, after citing several examples of this, writes: 'Nobody believes the nonsense in any one advertisement, every one is affected by the mist of deception which we continually breathe.'

Here then is one of our primary tasks, to recall into our common life a reverence for truthfulness. We go back to the Apostle's bidding—'Speaking the truth *in love*.' There is the governing rule. Some people claim a great reputation for truthfulness because, as they put it, 'I always say what I think.' It would frequently be better if they would think about what they say. Truthfulness does not mean being inconsiderately rude. St. Paul did not begin his defence before King Agrippa by denouncing the defects in that monarch's life. Truthfulness is created by the working of love in every relation of life, love of God, love of our neighbour, and, in the right sense, love of ourselves. Let us take the third first. Truth in the inward parts is the foundation of a healthy soul. The habitual liar is obviously spiritually diseased. But there are many smaller degrees of falseness which can work mischief within us. There are all the affectations by which we pretend to be what we are not. We may pretend to be better than we are, as the Pharisees did; or by what has been called, 'inverted Pharisaism,' to be worse than we are. But, more than this, if we care for truth, we shall pray to be delivered from all those careless inaccuracies of thought and speech, which reveal a lack of inward discipline. How splendid it is when we meet one who seems to be incapable of this. He is in himself a moral tonic, like the mysterious character in Jerome's *Passing of the Third Floor Back*, who is so transparently sincere that the shifty stockbroker, who is going to plant some worthless shares on him, finds that he simply cannot utter the lies he was intending to tell him.

Then truthfulness as owed to our neighbours. No man lives to himself. Society rests upon the soundness of credit in every sphere of life. That means that commerce and politics must own the supremacy of the law of God. When the day comes for the peace treaties which are to secure justice for the nations we shall pray that they may be drawn by those who will put truth first, cost what it may. But they will need all the support which Christian opinion can give them, for service is not rendered to truth without sacrifice.

So we come to the call to be true to God. We learn that soonest by being constantly in the presence of His Son, as in the days of His flesh men learnt just by being with Him that shams were at an end. There is a word used more than once in the Gospels which expresses the steadfast gaze with which our Lord looked at those who came to Him. Out of the depths of His own soul, unclouded by any falseness, came the glance which pierced the innermost hearts of men, till they knew themselves for what they were. And still His Spirit can light up our souls and dispel the shadows in which untruth lurks. There are many things which tempt us to be less than true—pride, fear, sloth, and all their company. But the promise is sure: 'When the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all truth.'

The Story of Amos in Dialogue.

By the Reverend John L. Riach, B.D., Largs.

Alexander Whyte of Free St. George's once chose as his text St. Paul's famous words, 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.' He informed his hearers that he had been reading Martin Luther. 'Let us summon the spirit of Luther to our midst to hear what he has to say on this verse,' he declared to his people. Opening the door which leads to the pulpit he beckoned the imaginary reformer to stand beside him. 'Martin Luther,' said Whyte solemnly, 'what am I to say to this people on this text?'

'What does it say? "Grace did abound"? Do you know anything then about grace, Alexander Whyte?'

'Not very much,' was the slow reply.

'Stand aside and let me speak to this people about grace,' and forthwith Whyte began to read extracts from Luther's works on grace. Having completed these he turned to the supposed figure and asked:

'What else should be said on this text, Martin Luther?'

'What more does the text say? "Where sin abounded." Do you know anything about sin, Alexander Whyte?'

'Sin,' replied the minister in his thunderous voice. 'Sin! Martin Luther, you may take your leave. Sin! I know all about sin and will speak to this people on that.' And forthwith Whyte spoke on the blackness of the human heart as only he could. This sermon was largely a dialogue between Alexander Whyte on the one hand and an imaginary Martin Luther on the other.

Now J. M. Barrie, in *The Greenwood Hat*, declares, 'Dialogue is a literary form which delights me. To this day, I write many of my letters in it. I would preach in dialogue if I were a clergyman.' Suppose one were to take Barrie's advice and seek to preach on the story of Amos in dialogue, might it not run something like this?

Scene I. A shepherd's tent on the hills of Tekoa, ten miles to the south of Jerusalem. Amos, a shepherd and cultivator of the sycamore fig, is gazing into the gathering gloom for his friend Nabal for whom he has sent. The log fire which crackles sharply in the frosty stillness and sends its sparks in a hundred directions lights up his strong face upon which is a purposeful look.

'Shalom Amos! Peace be with you! Sorry I'm so late. I'd have been here ere this had not a lamb strayed. While rescuing it, of course the rest of the flock had to scatter and be gathered again.'

'There's no need to apologize for your late arrival, Nabal. I knew you'd come and right glad I am to see you.'

'Well, why have you sent for me? The usual reason, I suppose? You would have me shepherd your flock and dress your fig trees while you go on a trading mission to the north.'

'No, not exactly. Let me throw some more logs on this fire. It's cold o' nights. What's more, I don't like the roaring of the young lions in the valley thickets yonder. Fire is the great scaremonger, though. Nothing like it, Nabal, to keep the most ravenous animals from the sheepfold. Why did I summon you to look after my sheep, you were asking? Well you may! This time I go on no trading mission, but to prophesy.'

'Prophesy! What's come over you, Amos? We shepherds are religious men. By the light of the fire and the moon we read the Law while on watch, and we fear God, but you are the first ever to think of turning preacher.'

'I know it sounds presumptuous, but something has happened. Many a time and oft you have been good enough, my friend, to shepherd my flock while I went abroad to sell my wool and figs. Far have I travelled in divers directions on these trading missions. The last sortie from my native hills took me as far north as Samaria. It's a festering city that turns the heart sick. The costly abodes of the grandees stand out prominently, but they cannot hide the hovels where countless poor, crushed by their merciless overlords, are herded. Children with wan faces, young women with the untimely stoop of age, men who have forgotten how to smile, and in the eyes of all that helpless despairing look you see in a sheep that has been caught in a thicket for days and has no longer the strength to bleat for help. The injustice of it all haunts me. I have been robbed of sleep by this scene and wished that some one might rise and speak. But yesterday, when following the flock, God laid His hand upon me as surely as He did on Moses in Midian, and commanded me to go north to denounce this crying injustice and to pronounce the doom that awaits the Northern kingdom should the warning remain unheeded.'

'Doom, you say. What doom?'

'Four visions have I been given by God, Nabal. I saw a plague of locusts descending on a field of tender green shoots and stripping it bare as a new-ploughed field in a few minutes. I saw the blazing

sun dry up every spring and stream in the land. I saw a builder testing the erectness of a city wall with his plumb-line who, finding it off the perpendicular, tore it down. I saw a basket of summer fruit pulled from the dying trees at the fall. All betoken destruction. That is the frightful doom that awaits unsuspecting Israel, destruction complete.'

'But it's madness, Amos, to preach thus to the people of Israel, especially one like yourself who hails from the Southern kingdom of Judah. If they hearkened not to their own mighty prophets, Elijah and Elisha, how will they listen to such a knell-pronouncing prophecy from you? I tremble for you!'

'Nabal, when the trumpet sounds its clear warning note in a city not a soldier disobeys that call. Not one! God hath spoken to me. I cannot disobey Him, be my mission ever so mad or dangerous.'

'Where do you pronounce your prophecy, since you are set on so doing?'

'At the shrine of Bethel.'

'That's the Royal Chapel!'

'Exactly! It is there those responsible for the injustice of the kingdom are to be found, so to Bethel I must hie me.'

'You are a brave man, Amos. Rather would I rescue the remnants of a sheep from the mouth of a lion than undertake your task. Go! and the God in whose name you speak be with you.'

SCENE II. The Royal Chapel at Bethel. The nobles and rich from the capital at Samaria are present. Amaziah, in the gorgeous robes of the High Priest, stands before the altar. The last lamb has been sacrificed and as the wisp of smoke rises heavenwards he turns to pronounce the blessing. He finds a strange figure confronting him, one clad in a rough camel-hair garment, wearing heavy dust-covered sandals, and carrying a shepherd's staff—Amos.

'Surely you are a stranger to these parts. Your garb betokens a shepherd, and from the Southern kingdom of Judah, too, if I'm not mistaken. What do you here? Seldom is it we have the honour to welcome one from Uzziah's realm to the Royal Chapel of Israel.'

'True, O High Priest, I am a shepherd, Amos by name. My mission is to utter a prophecy from God to the people of this kingdom. May I make speech?'

'Never deny we true prophets utterance. Jehovah has blessed us, His people, richly with good things. Any word of His we welcome. Say on!'

'Overlooking your impregnable city of Samaria stand hills like giant sentinels. Imagine upon the peak of each a stranger stood able to see clearly with the eye of God, what should they witness in your proud capital? Let their gaze rest on the costly houses rivalling the royal palace and there should they see within besotted men who loll on ivory couches drinking wine by the bowlful and digging for themselves an early grave with their gluttonous teeth. By their side are women sunk to the level of kine whose passions are uncontrolled, whose greed is insatiable, and whose heartless cruelty to the dispossessed is unspeakable. Let these watchers on the hills view the markets and bazaars, and there should they witness merchants who sell adulterated corn at exorbitant prices to the already undernourished underlings. They grudge the Sabbath as a day of rest and weary for the dawn of the new day that their false balances might swing busily once more. Let these strangers look down upon the law courts at your gates where every judge has his price and the unprivileged have no redress when swindled by those whose purses bulge with gold. Let the onlookers brood on the hovels of the poor in the narrow side-streets to which the sun never finds entrance and where the cry of their misery is drowned by the riotous revelry of those whose prey they are. You guilty people stand here in your rustling silks and bejewelled persons seeking to make amends for your crimes by worshipping God at this shrine. Sacrifice every lamb in the land if you will. Let your songs and instrumental music be of the choicest. God is not mocked. Your worship is an abomination unto Him. It is neither genuflexion nor sacrifice He seeks of you but justice; justice for the unprivileged; justice in business; justice in your courts. Let justice roll on like water and righteousness like a perennial stream. Thus saith the Lord.'

'What blasphemy! How dare you denounce the sacred worship of our holy shrine. Does not the Law call upon men to worship God in the sanctuary for such is well pleasing in His sight.'

'Only the worship of the man whose hands are clean! Never the worship of the cheat, the profligate, or of him whose heart is of stone. Repent of your ways and establish justice. If not, catastrophe will overtake you from the highest in the land to the lowest. As a cart laden with sheaves totters dangerously on the rumbling farm road your nation will totter and fall. Against your enemies the defence of Samaria shall not prevail. Your king's royal blood will dye the earth, your warriors slain by the thousand, your churches levelled to the ground, your sensual beauties pulled out of the city to a shameful fate like fish hooked suddenly out of a stream, and a sorrow deeper than the mourning for the loss of an only child chill the heart of those left in this land. There shall be escape for none. As a man flees from a lion and meeting a bear jumps into the refuge of an old house and rests panting against

its crumbling wall and is bitten by a serpent, so none shall avoid suffering.'

'Enough, sir! This is treason. One word more and I shall send a request to His Majesty to deal with you.'

'Keep your threats, Amaziah, for those who fear you. I fear God alone. Threaten me as you will. He who strikes me, strikes God. He who hearkens not to my voice, stops his ears to the Almighty. If you repent not and refuse justice the doom pronounced will surely fall. And you, Amaziah, the blind leader of this blind people, will likewise suffer. Your wife will be dishonoured, your sons slain, and you shall die an exile in a polluted land.'

'Prophet you call yourself. Madman is the word. Perhaps you have been hired by the King of Judah to strike terror in our hearts by your blasphemous fantasy. Get back to your own land and there utter your doleful dirge. They'll pay you well for such rich denunciation of their prosperous neighbour. Begone, sir!'

'Insult me as you care, Amaziah, that does not eradicate truth. No hireling prophet am I, but a simple shepherd who has spoken the word of the Lord. If you heed it not in the days to come then prepare to meet thy God!'

Scene III. Twenty-five years later in 721 B.C.; Samaria has been besieged for three years by the Assyrians. The King, Hoshea, who has been on the throne only since before the siege began has summoned Amaziah to the royal palace.

'All your prayers and sacrifices are unavailing, Amaziah. No help has come from any of our neighbours. All attempts to break the Assyrian iron ring have failed. To hold out longer is impossible. We must surrender.'

'Can't we hold out for a few days more, Your Majesty? Surely God will not allow us, His chosen people, to fall! Surely our prayers will somehow be answered. It is often at the bitter end the Lord comes to the rescue.'

'We have reached the bitter end now. You are a priest, I a soldier. We are finished. Our gallant warriors who have hurled back the invader from our ramparts a thousand times can stand no longer. Dare to go through the streets, and plague, starvation, death stalk everywhere. There is nothing for it but surrender. We must prepare to die like men.'

'Your Majesty, once the Assyrian hordes stream through the city gates, death will be an easy way out of their clutches. Would such a kindly fate were mine, but languishing exile in a foreign land will be my cruel lot, alas!'

'How do you know that?'

'Through a man called Amos, Your Majesty. Twenty-five years ago, when our nation had reached the high meridian of its glory, he prophesied at Bethel this catastrophe which is about to overtake us for our unjust ways.'

'I believe I have heard of that shepherd from Tekoa, now you mention him, but only a lad was I when he spoke, and since I have been too busy with affairs of State and you with Church ceremonial to pay heed to his warnings. Would to God we had! There has been more in the warnings of these prophets than we imagined.'

'True, O King. To hide the truth from ourselves we threatened him and sent him packing. I see him now as if it were but yesterday he spoke. The flashing eye, the ringing voice, the transparent sincerity of his words, the divine authority behind his message. If only we had listened to his impassioned cry for justice. If only we had sought God as he called on us to do, this tragic hour would never have struck. Curious how worldly success and evil close the ears of the heart to divine truth and only by disasters do they become unstopped. What was it he said to me? "Your wife will be dishonoured, your sons slain, and you shall die an exile in a polluted land." My love, my boys, would to God I could suffer and die for you!'

Scene IV. A tiny village in Germany in 1938. Pastor Schmidt, who refused to renounce the Old Testament on the grounds that it was a Jewish book, as commanded by the Nazi Party, stands in danger of arrest. He has formed a Bible Class for the session and members of the congregation to study the Old Testament which the Nazis flout. It is a class where question and answer is allowed. They are studying Amos. Pastor Schmidt is speaking.

'"Let justice roll on like water." That is the message of Amos, my friends. It is a cry for justice. He pleads for justice for the poor, in the courts, in business, in the government of the land.'

'But, Pastor, haven't we outlived the law of justice? In the New Testament Jesus teaches the principle of love. Surely it is a higher law than that of justice. Shylock demanded his pound of flesh in payment of the debt as promised. All appeals for mercy he ignored. There's justice for you, demanding rights and knowing no forgiveness. Love waives rights and eagerly forgives. Surely it is Christ's higher law of love we should seek to obey, not Amos' mere law of justice?'

'Well spoken, my friend, and quite true. Christ's law of love is greater than Amos' law of justice. But we cannot climb the higher peaks until we have first learned to scale the lower ones. It is by the lower things we reach the higher. Men cannot do the noblest of all things—love one another—until first they have learned to be just one to the other. Love involves justice. How can one man or one class or one nation love another

and at the same time be unjust to one another? We must learn to be just before we can love and to me it appears we have not learned to do the lower of these two yet. Look at the injustice of the grinding poverty of some in our land and the fabulous wealth of others. Look at the injustice in business. Look at the injustice of our government in sending men to concentration camps without a trial. We speak too grandiloquently of loving our fellows as if we had long surpassed the previous stage Amos pleads for of being just, when all the time we have not reached it.'

'So according to you, Pastor, only when we have learned first to be just, is love between man and man, and class and class, and nation and nation, possible?'

'Exactly! The State wants us to scrap the Old Testament, including Amos with his cry for justice, when that is the very thing we need. Who's that knocking so loudly at the door, I wonder? Ah! the secret police. So you have come to arrest me!'

'Don't go, Pastor! Resist! This is an outrage! Don't you understand that it means the concentration camp without a trial?'

'My friends, I know what is in store for me, but resistance is useless. It will spell more arrests and worse punishment. I will go quietly. Let this teach you the truth of my words. We have not reached the stage of being just when men can be arrested and punished without trial; and until we have justice can we speak of loving one another? Work, pray, fight for the day when o'er our land and o'er the world Amos' dream of justice flowing like water may be realized. Then, and only then, shall we be well on the way towards the fulfilment of a fairer dream spoken by a greater than Amos who said, "This is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you." Farewell! and may God be with you and me, my people.'

Contributions and Comments.

The Authorship of Luke–Acts.

All the commentaries on St. Luke's Gospel note the unusual order—Peter, John, James—in which the names of the three disciples appear in 8^{51} and 9^{28}. It is not surprising that this peculiarity should have given rise to textual variations. There would be every inducement to scribal assimilation to the more usual order. Textual critics, however, seem to be agreed that the unusual order represents the original text, and Dr. B. S. Easton (*The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 130 n.) writes that only H. von Soden (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*) prefers the order 'Peter, James, and John.'

Most of the commentaries note that the order 'Peter, John, and James' occurs also in the list of the Eleven in Acts 1^{13}. The explanations of the change are various. H. K. Luce in the commentary on St. Luke in the Cambridge Greek Texts, with a note on 9^{28}, suggests that John precedes James because the former was the more prominent in the Church of St. Luke's day. Lonsdale Ragg, in the *Westminster Commentary on St. Luke* describes the unusual order as 'the order of prominence as distinct from that of seniority.' In *The Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 342 n. 1 (a comment on Lk 9^{54}), it is suggested that the early order was 'James, John,' which was changed in Luke's own day owing to James's death and John's later prominence. There does seem at all events to be a tendency to associate Peter and John (so in Lk 22^{8}; Ac $3^{1.\ 3.\ 4.\ 11}$ $4^{13.\ 19}$ 8^{14}). Indeed Loisy (*L'Evangile selon Luc*) goes further in a comment on Lk 22^{8} and suggests that the very naming of the two disciples sent by Jesus to prepare for the Last Supper, is to be attributed 'au rédacteur qui, dans les Actes, s'est plu à montrer Jean auprès de Pierre.'

That may be true and it may be another explanation of the unusual order 'Peter, John, and James' in Lk 8^{51} 9^{28} and Ac 1^{13}. But nevertheless the very fact of that order remains noteworthy, whatever its explanation, and it is striking that it never occurs in Matthew or Mark. Has it ever been suggested that in these three passages, there is to be found further slight evidence for the common authorship of Luke and Acts? The passages would provide such evidence whatever the explanation of the unusual order might be, and in spite of the fact that James precedes John in Lk 5^{10} 6^{14} and 9^{54}. It should be added that neither of the two passages in question in the Gospel (8^{51} 9^{28}) are included in the list of passages which Streeter (*The Four Gospels*, 222) assigns to Proto-Luke. On the other hand the last three passages named are so assigned. If the Proto-Luke hypothesis is rejected, this last piece of evidence is, of course, irrelevant, but the main argument stands. If, on the other hand, it is accepted, and if Streeter's reconstruction of Proto-Luke is accurate, then it will mean that it is the authorship of Luke in its final form, and of Acts which is under discussion.

S. H. Price,

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

Albert Schweitzer.

A worthy tribute has been paid to a remarkable man in a book by Professor Oskar Kraus—*Albert Schweitzer: His Work and His Philosophy* (A. & C. Black; 6s. net). It is not a biography. It is rather a portrait and a discussion. There are two themes in the book, the greatness of Schweitzer as a man and a Christian, and the errors of Schweitzer the philosopher.

Professor Kraus thinks Schweitzer to be almost unparalleled as a man. The world is rich, he says, in men who have achieved great things in fields of activity and knowledge, but poor in great, selfless characters who have served as a beacon for others, lighting up the path for them. And Schweitzer is one of the greatest of these. He was a doctor four times over—of theology, of philosophy, of music, and of medicine. He was the greatest authority on Bach in Europe. He was a Professor in the University of Strasbourg. And he turned his back on all his artistic and philosophical activities and honours to go as a missionary to the natives of Equatorial Africa. He studied medicine in order to fit himself for this work. Why? There are three reasons given in this book, and together they form an impressive apologia for foreign missions.

One was the impression made on him by the acts and words of Jesus. He could not get away from their challenge. He felt that our only right to happiness was our readiness to share it with the unhappy. To Schweitzer there were three great figures in history—Jesus, Bach, and Kant—but Jesus was immeasurably the greatest. Since he wrote his great work, 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus,' Jesus had been the supreme influence of his life, and it was this above all 'drove him from centres of culture where he was so prominent a figure into the forests of the Ogowe.'

But there was another motive. He conceived his mission work as an atonement. We have been burdened with a great debt by the treatment of the dark races by the white. Who can describe, he asks passionately, the cruelties and injustices which these races have suffered at the hands of Europeans, or the misery produced by the fiery drinks and the horrible diseases we have taken to them? We are not free to confer, or not confer, benefits as we please. Anything we give them is not benevolence but atonement, and when we have done all in our power we shall not have atoned for the thousandth part of our guilt.

But there was a third powerful motive which operated in Schweitzer's mind, the miseries in the dark forests which he could relieve. In his account of his mission work in that unforgetable book, 'On the Edge of the Primeval Forest,' he gives a moving picture of the saving and healing labours by which hope and ease and happiness have been brought to these dark regions. You remember the scene? The poor sufferer awaking after the operation and crying 'I have no more pain,' and the doctor saying to him, 'It is the Lord Jesus who has sent the doctor and his wife to the Ogowe.' I cannot imagine a more powerful plea for the great Christian mission than is contained in this book.

There is a good deal of it devoted to Schweitzer's philosophy. Schweitzer was a Kantian; the foundation of all his thinking and belief was to be found in ethics. Dr. Kraus argues eagerly on the other side. The Master of Balliol who introduces the book agrees with Schweitzer. And, whichever side you lean to, you will have a strenuous time here. But when the philosophizing is done, the thing that remains with you is the picture of a very great man and Christian, and for this we must give our profound thanks to the author.

F. J. Rae.

Dives and Lazarus.

'I had read about the physical miseries of the natives in the virgin forests; I had heard about them from missionaries, and the more I thought about it the stranger it seemed to me that we Europeans trouble ourselves so little about the great humanitarian task which offers itself to us in far-off lands. *The parable of Dives and Lazarus seemed to me to have been spoken directly of us!* We are Dives, for, through the advances of medical science, we now know a great deal about disease and pain, and have innumerable means of fighting them: yet we take as a matter of course the incalculable advantages which this new wealth gives us! Out there in the colonies, however, sits wretched Lazarus, the coloured folk, who suffers from illness and pain just as much as we do, nay, much more, and has absolutely no means of fighting them. *And just as Dives sinned against the poor man at his gate because for want of thought he never put himself in his place and let his heart and conscience tell him what he ought to do, so do we sin against the poor man at our gate.*[1]

T. R. Glover.

Among the 'Brief Biographies of Leading Laymen,' published by the Carey Press at the modest sum of sixpence, is one on *Terrot Reaveley Glover, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Scholar and Christian*, by Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D. It is a pleasant tribute by a friend of forty years, and we get as much in it as the modest proportions of the series would allow. It is very much to be hoped, however, that a biography will be published which will preserve for us memorials of one of the great

[1] O. Kraus, *Albert Schweitzer*, 2.

Christian figures of our time, one whom multitudes who had never seen him loved, so potent was the charm of his writings and of the personality behind them.

Dr. Glover's ancestry was largely Scottish, and to this Dr. Robinson ascribes an outward reserve in him which concealed an emotional nature capable of a white heat. Dr. Robinson adds the cryptic remark: 'The Scottish temperament is crustacean rather than vertebrate.' The crustaceans are animals with a hard shell, such as crabs; the vertebrates are animals with a spinal column, such as mammals. This is rather hard on the Scot, but perhaps we may take it that Glover was both crustacean *and* vertebrate. His spinal column was a very stiff one, and on certain matters it helped him to dig his toes in very firmly. He was, for example, a strong individualist, and I gather from his present interpreter that on the subject of church unity he was all for the rights and values of denominations.

As everyone knows, Glover was Fellow and Classical Lecturer at St. John's College, Cambridge; he was also Public Orator there for twenty years, and one of his most delightful books was the 'Cambridge Retrospect,' published not long ago. He was a scholar with a wide range of knowledge, but his scholarship was worn lightly; he had such a mastery of his resources, that they kept breaking in with delightful illumination, whatever he was writing about. But what fascinated us in Glover more than anything was his humanity, his interest in human beings, of which his humour was a part. It was this human appeal that gave him his great influence over students. His work for the Student Christian Movement was a large and important part of his life; not only what he did for it but what it did for him. His own sincerity made him hate such vices as vanity, pomposity, unreality, whether in men or books. It was this humanity, probably, that made him a little uneasy in broadcasting. He did not like an 'unseen audience,' we are told. On the first occasion of such an event, when he was conducted into the studio and shown the microphone he was taken aback and asked: 'Have I got to talk to that—sewing-machine?' Fortunately a small audience was gathered who gave him the necessary human contact.

These reflections are suggested by this sketch-portrait by one of Glover's intimate friends. But they do not do justice to the surprising completeness and suggestiveness of that portrait, and especially to the touching and revealing pages on Glover's religious development and the evangelical zeal for Christ that burned steadily in his heart. 'His main effort,' says Dr. Robinson, 'was always directed towards bringing other people to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.' That truth was 'evangelical' and simple, but, to quote again, 'he was certainly not one of those who demand a simple gospel when they really mean a complicated system of theology.'

I cannot forbear giving a slight remembrance of my own. I once had the happiness of spending a long evening in the company of Principal David Cairns and his guest, Dr. Glover. It was a memorable evening, for both were in great form and both were men with a keen sense of humour. They were controversial, provocative, and pleasantly abusive. I am ashamed to say that the only concrete reminiscence of that joyous evening was Dr. Glover's claim, insisted on at great length, that the Baptists were the true High Churchmen because they gave the Sacrament such an all-important place. But I was privileged to see a great 'scholar and Christian' in an irresponsible mood.

F. J. Rae.

Shoving Behind.

'One of Dr. Glover's students, training for the Baptist ministry, was alarmed one Sunday morning to find "T.R." in his congregation. After the service Glover went to the young preacher and said, "I hope you weren't worried because I was there; remember that when I worship with my friends I come to shove behind."'[1]

Knowledge of Scripture.

'Fearless, Niemoeller travelled everywhere, relating to overflow crowds in his crisp military way the facts of Nazi attacks on Christian doctrine and organization. He became enormously popular, and the party had good cause to hate and fear him.

'Twice a month, on Mondays, the Dahlem church held "open evenings" for the study of the Bible and catechism. Crowds flocked to these in such numbers that they were transferred from the parsonage to the parish house, and then to the church auditorium. Extra subway cars and buses were put on to accommodate the traffic. Many came out of political interest. Niemoeller never attacked an action of the state unless a vital Christian issue was at stake.

'An amusing incident caused Niemoeller to comment on the inadequacy of confirmation instruction. A young couple expressly requested him to refrain from using an Old Testament text for the customary remarks at the marriage ceremony. When asked for suggestions as to what he might appropriately quote, the couple quickly proposed: "As for me and my house we will serve the Lord," or "Whither thou goest I will go."'[2]

[1] T. H. Robinson, *Terrot Reaveley Glover*.

[2] Bella Fromm, *Blood and Banquets: A Berlin Social Diary*, 214.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.